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# Introduction

**Instructions**

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State’s systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State’s General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

The Maine Department of Education (Maine DOE) Office of Special Services and Child Development Services (CDS) implement the birth to twenty (B-20) General Supervision System to manage and oversee all aspects of effective implementation and integrated monitoring activities pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Evaluations and interventions of Local Education Agencies (LEAs) focus on improving infant, toddler and school-age student outcomes. The process is designed to enhance partnerships among the Maine DOE Office of Special Services, CDS, LEAs, other educational and community agencies, service providers, and parents in implementing Part C and Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). These partnerships focus on early intervention and special education services and systems that directly impact results for children and the development and implementation of improvement strategies to address identified needs.Maine DOE monitoring activities are dedicated to improving educational results and purposeful outcomes for all children with disabilities. The Department continues to ensure districts and regional CDS sites provide programs and services for children with disabilities as described and required under federal law Section 616 of the 2004 Amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Multiple data sources and methods are used to monitor every LEA in the state. Integrated on-site and off-site monitoring activities ensure Maine's capacity to identify and correct noncompliance and facilitate improved performance. Additionally, Maine DOE provides technical assistance, professional development, and a variety of resources with the purpose of developing supports that are accessible to LEAs and stakeholders around the state.The Introduction sections below address Maine's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance, Professional Development, Stakeholder Involvement, and Public Reporting.

**Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year**

264

**General Supervision System**

**The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.**

Schools in the State of Maine are organized into School Administrative Units (SAUs) as defined by Maine Statute, 20-A MRSA Section 1 (26). An SAU is a State-approved unit of school administration and includes only the following:1. A municipal school unit;2. A regional school unit formed pursuant to chapter 103-A;3. An alternative organizational structure as approved by the commissioner and approved by the voters;4. A school administrative district that does not provide public education for the entire span of kindergarten to grade 12 that has not reorganized as a regional school unit pursuant to Chapter 103-A;5. A community school district that has not reorganized as a regional school unit pursuant to chapter 103- A;6. A municipal or quasi-municipal district responsible for operating public schools that has not reorganized as a regional school unit pursuant to chapter 103-A;7. A municipal school unit, school administrative district, community school district, regional school unit or any other quasi-municipal district responsible for operating public schools that forms a part of an alternative organizational structure approved by the commissioner; and8. A public charter school authorized under chapter 112 by an entity other than a local school board. Throughout this APR, the terms SAU, LEA and district will be used interchangeably.Child Development Services (CDS) is the governmental entity that serves as an Intermediate Educational Unit (IEU) of the Maine Department of Education (Maine DOE). As described in state statute: The Maine DOE Commissioner, “shall establish and supervise the state intermediate educational unit. The state intermediate educational unit is established as a body corporate and politic and as a public instrumentality of the State for the purpose of conducting child find activities as provided in 20 United States Code, Section 1412 (a) (3) for children from birth to under 6 years of age, ensuring the provision of early intervention services for eligible children from birth to under 3 years of age and ensuring a free, appropriate public education for eligible children at least 3 years of age and under 6 years of age.” MRSA 20- A §7209(3).The General Supervision System (GSS) manages and oversees the needs of children with disabilities ages birth to 20 as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and is overseen by the federal Office of Special Education Programs. GSS assumes the following responsibilities:State Performance Plan (SPP). The SPP is an accountability mechanism for the State and Maine SAUs. It provides measurable indication of Maine's performance in specific statutory priority areas of IDEA. Maine Department of Education (DOE) is responsible for the SPP. Maine DOE's data manager works collaboratively with the federal programs coordinator for the collection of State and LEA data and performance measures, corrections of noncompliance and activities supporting LEAs improving results for children with disabilities. The CDS Deputy Director and Quality Assurance Director are responsible for the collection of CDS data and performance measures, corrections of noncompliance and activities supporting CDS sites improving results for pre-school children with disabilities. Outcomes of the SPP inform monitoring activities (e.g., child find, transition from early intervention and postsecondary transition planning).Integrated Monitoring Activities. Monitoring activities are dedicated to improving educational results and purposeful outcomes for all children with disabilities. The Department continues to ensure districts and regional CDS sites provide programs and services for children with disabilities as described and required under federal law Section 616 of the 2004 Amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Multiple data sources and methods are used to monitor every SAU in the state. Integrated on-site and off-site monitoring activities ensure Maine's capacity to identify and correct noncompliance and facilitate improved performance.Policies, Procedures & Effective Implementation. The State of Maine has policies, procedures and effective implementation of practices that are aligned with and support the implementation of IDEA. The policies and procedures include descriptions of methods the State will use to detect non-compliance and ensure correction of non-compliance when found. Effective implementation of policies, procedures and practices also addresses program improvement through planning, coordination, incentives and follow-up. Policies, procedures, and effective implementation or practices, aligned with IDEA, are designed to support program improvement and focus attention on specific areas of compliance and program performance as identified through an analysis of data. Resources are available on the following webpage: https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed.Targeted Technical Assistance & Professional Development. Targeted technical assistance and professional development enable Maine DOE and CDS to direct and impact the quality of the effective implementation of policies and procedures. Technical assistance is linked to the SPP indicators and outcomes for students. Technical assistance and capacity-building activities are implemented at varying levels and through multiple means such as websites, documents, coaching, mentoring, training of trainers, local, regional and/or statewide meetings and conferences, direct training from state personnel or from other resources.Public Reporting. The requirement for public reporting on LEA performance is a critical provision in ensuring accountability and focusing on improved results for children with disabilities. LEA profiles are used as the basis for determinations of LEA program performance. Each indicator is evaluated for level of determination to provide the LEA with measurement-specific feedback on their implementation of IDEA. An overall determination is assigned to each LEA in alignment with the requirements of the State Performance Plan (SPP): Meets Requirements; Needs Assistance; Needs Intervention; or Needs Substantial Intervention. These determinations set the level of support and intervention provided and define areas of required action and follow-up. Data profiles for LEAs are posted on the Maine DOE website: https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed/data/public. Additionally, assessment data are available on the following wepage: https://www.maine.gov/doe/Testing\_Accountability/MECAS/results.Effective Dispute Resolution. The timely resolution of complaints, mediations and due process actions is required for complaint dispute resolutions. Effective Dispute Resolution addresses matters related to due process procedures such as mediations, hearings and complaint investigations. The due process team provides training for mediators and hearing officials, school personnel, agency personnel and parents. Technical assistance is available to school districts and parents. Maine's State Complaint Investigation Reports contain findings of Maine's Education Commissioner as to whether violations of law under IDEA and/or State special education laws or regulations have occurred. Findings of violation typically result in a corrective action plan.

**Technical Assistance System**

**The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.**

Maine Department of Education and Child Development Services (CDS) provide a range of technical assistance, from minimal assistance to substantial interventions, to improve performance. Technical assistance is implemented at varying levels and through multiple means such as websites, local, regional and/or state-wide meetings and conferences, virtual or direct training from state personnel and from other resources.Maine DOE and CDS have several mechanisms in place to ensure high quality, evidence-based practice technical assistance and support to LEAs occurs in a timely manner. Structures that exist within the Office of Special Services and CDS connect to professional development initiatives across the Department of Education and through National TA Centers to provide collaborative technical assistance.Targeted technical assistance: As needs arise, Maine DOE is able to direct the quality of the effective implementation of policies and procedures through targeted technical assistance. The department is informed of needs directly by districts, regional CDS sites, contracted providers, community members, families or the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC). Technical assistance is then designed to meet the needs of the LEA and can take any variety of forms, including on-line resources, documents, coaching, mentoring, and training of trainers or leader teams. In addition, Maine DOE regularly communicates with LEA's regarding current issues and offers guidance in a publication called the Maine DOE Update.Listen and Learn Series: This biweekly webinar series is intended to offer professional development and technical assistance for special education directors in the field. The Office of Special Services offers a Listen & Learn webinar series that is typically accessed by teacher leaders in the field, including special education directors, program directors and regional CDS site directors. Through a regular schedule teachers and other educators can plan to participate. In addition, these webinars are recorded and posted for access at a later date, facilitating the use of these learning opportunities by LEAs in their professional development to their own staff. Topics are identified through participant polls and feedback from the field, and have included post-secondary transition planning, related services, and services for children who are blind or visually impaired, among others.New Directors Academy: In collaboration with the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) Maine DOE presents a multi-day training for special education directors and CDS regional directors in the field for two years or less. Trainings typically follow an alternating year schedule. By working with MADSEC the department is able to respond to the training needs of the State.

**Professional Development System**

**The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.**

Professional development, as part of an effective system of general supervision, is directly linked to the SPP and to the improvement activities. Maine DOE and Child Development Services State IEU (CDSSIEU) provides a variety of opportunities to impact performance, from statewide activities to regional trainings, all with a purpose of developing supports that are accessible to LEAs around the state.Maine DOE Office of Special Services and CDSSIEU contracts and enters into working relationships with technical assistance and dissemination resources regionally and nationally to provide evidence-based practice professional development to educators and educator leaders, parents, and interested parties. Maine continues to access support from the National Technical Assistance Center for Transition (NTACT) to improve indicator B-13 compliance. NTACT has also assisted in the dissemination of professional development addressing standards aligned IEP development. In addition, Maine DOE continues to use federal funds to support the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research (MAIER). MAIER provides TA to leader teams that operate in the LEA's.All contractors providing technical assistance to regional sites in the State are supported by national technical assistance centers in order to provide the most current practice available. All work done by contracted individuals must be consistent with Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) SPP and APR indicators as well as Maine Unified Special Education Regulations (MUSER).Listen & Learn Series: This biweekly webinar series is intended to offer professional development and technical assistance for special education directors and regional CDS Directors in the field. The Office of Special Services offers a Listen & Learn webinar series that is made available to educators, special education directors, program directors, Child Development Services employees, and community service providers as requested. Through a regular schedule teachers and other educators can plan to participate. In addition, these webinars are recorded and posted for access at a later date, facilitating the use of these learning opportunities by LEAs in their professional development to their own staff. Topics are identified through participant polls and feedback from the field, and have included post-secondary transition planning, related services, and services for children who are blind or visually impaired, among others.Webinars: Webinars are intended for a more specific audience than the Listen & Learn series (e.g. Excess Cost and Maintenance of Effort).State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Maine's SSIP, entitled Math4ME, provides professional development on math content and evidence-based teaching practices to instructors who teach math to students with disabilities. Trained teachers additionally receive coaching during the school year from a Teacher-Leader who has received advanced training on math content and pedagogy. Details of the Math4ME initiative are described in Indicator 17 of the Annual Performance Report.

**Stakeholder Involvement**

**The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.**

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. Membership is specified in the federal regulations and a majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three to 20. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people: two parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26); an individual with a disability; a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative from the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. A majority of the members of the panel must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). Among the members is an individual who represents the SAP on the State Systemic Improvement Plan stakeholder group. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders. The director of the Maine DOE Office of Special Services met with the SAP during their quarterly meetings throughout FFY2018. Members were informed of department priorities and current issues and advice was sought from the membership for the Maine DOE to consider in legislation, rule-making, procedures and reporting. Topics included revisions to the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations, the State Systemic Improvement Plan, Significant Disproportionality Policy, and SPP/APR target-setting for FFY2019.Target-setting activities for the new SSIP consisted of series of meetings of the SAP membership in 2013 and 2014 during which members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. These meetings included input from the public. Past performance for each indicator in the first year with comparable consistent measurement with the baseline was identified. Possible targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years. Maine DOE staff members, including the director, data manager and SPP/APR coordinator, were available to answer any statistical or practical questions related to the indicators, past performance, or the analysis leading to suggestions of targets. SAP members discussed priorities and arrived at recommendations for targets for all results indicators (except B-17) for the life of the SPP. Additionally, in December, 2019, SAP members met to review all results indicator historical data and targets and recommended an extension of all results indicator targets for FFY2019.

**Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)**

YES

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.**

Public reporting on LEA performance is a critical provision in ensuring accountability and focusing on improved results for children with disabilities. All LEAs receive and review, on a yearly basis, a letter with their determination status, the rubric “Local Determination Levels Assistance and Enforcement”, and the LEA profile. The profiles provide indicator-specific performance and compliance data to the LEA and to the public for use in program improvement. The LEA profiles are used as the basis for determinations of LEA program performance. Each indicator is evaluated for level of determination to provide the LEA with measurement-specific feedback on their implementation of IDEA with regard to State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators. The individual determinations are then used to develop an overall determination with respect to the requirements of the SPP in one of the four required categories: Meets Requirements; Needs Assistance; Needs Intervention; or Needs Substantial Intervention. These determinations set the level of support and intervention provided and define areas of required action and follow-up.A complete copy of Maine’s FFY2017 APR, FFY2017 LEA determinations, and FFY2017 performance of LEAs on the SPP/APR targets are posted on the following webpage: https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed/data/public. Additionally, student assessment data are available on the following wepage: https://www.maine.gov/doe/Testing\_Accountability/MECAS/results.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## Intro - OSEP Response

The State has not publicly reported on the FFY 2018 (July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019) performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA.The State provided a FFY 2019 target for Indicator B-17, State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and OSEP accepts that target.

## Intro - Required Actions

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

**Measurement**

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | 2011 | 66.02% |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target >= | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% |
| Data | 70.38% | 70.97% | 73.88% | 72.37% | 72.46% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 90.00% | 90.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. Membership is specified in the federal regulations and a majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three to 20. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people: two parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26); an individual with a disability; a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative from the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. A majority of the members of the panel must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). Among the members is an individual who represents the SAP on the State Systemic Improvement Plan stakeholder group. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders. The director of the Maine DOE Office of Special Services met with the SAP during their quarterly meetings throughout FFY2018. Members were informed of department priorities and current issues and advice was sought from the membership for the Maine DOE to consider in legislation, rule-making, procedures and reporting. Topics included revisions to the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations, the State Systemic Improvement Plan, Significant Disproportionality Policy, and SPP/APR target-setting for FFY2019.Target-setting activities for the new SSIP consisted of series of meetings of the SAP membership in 2013 and 2014 during which members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. These meetings included input from the public. Past performance for each indicator in the first year with comparable consistent measurement with the baseline was identified. Possible targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years. Maine DOE staff members, including the director, data manager and SPP/APR coordinator, were available to answer any statistical or practical questions related to the indicators, past performance, or the analysis leading to suggestions of targets. SAP members discussed priorities and arrived at recommendations for targets for all results indicators (except B-17) for the life of the SPP. Additionally, in December, 2019, SAP members met to review all results indicator historical data and targets and recommended an extension of all results indicator targets for FFY2019.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 10/02/2019 | Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma | 2,113 |
| SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 10/02/2019 | Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate | 2,873 |
| SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695) | 10/02/2019 | Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table | 73.55% |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma** | **Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort eligible to graduate** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2,113 | 2,873 | 72.46% | 90.00% | 73.55% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Graduation Conditions**

**Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:**

4-year ACGR

**If extended, provide the number of years**

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain*.***

The standards for obtaining a high school diploma are outlined in Maine statute 20-A Section 4722, which can be found here: http://legislature.maine.gov/legis/statutes/20-A/title20-Asec4722.html. These standards include required numbers of courses in English, Social Studies, Mathematics, Science, and Fine Arts, and the availability of multiple pathways for demonstrating achievement of standards in these academic areas. Standards do not differ for students with IEPs; all students must meet the same requirements to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)**

NO

**If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 1 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Measurement**

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | **2013** | **19.83%** |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target <= | 19.83% | 19.83% | 19.80% | 19.80% | 19.00% |
| Data | 19.83% | 18.55% | 16.15% | 17.23% | 14.35% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 19.00% | 19.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. Membership is specified in the federal regulations and a majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three to 20. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people: two parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26); an individual with a disability; a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative from the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. A majority of the members of the panel must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). Among the members is an individual who represents the SAP on the State Systemic Improvement Plan stakeholder group. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders. The director of the Maine DOE Office of Special Services met with the SAP during their quarterly meetings throughout FFY2018. Members were informed of department priorities and current issues and advice was sought from the membership for the Maine DOE to consider in legislation, rule-making, procedures and reporting. Topics included revisions to the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations, the State Systemic Improvement Plan, Significant Disproportionality Policy, and SPP/APR target-setting for FFY2019.Target-setting activities for the new SSIP consisted of series of meetings of the SAP membership in 2013 and 2014 during which members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. These meetings included input from the public. Past performance for each indicator in the first year with comparable consistent measurement with the baseline was identified. Possible targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years. Maine DOE staff members, including the director, data manager and SPP/APR coordinator, were available to answer any statistical or practical questions related to the indicators, past performance, or the analysis leading to suggestions of targets. SAP members discussed priorities and arrived at recommendations for targets for all results indicators (except B-17) for the life of the SPP. Additionally, in December, 2019, SAP members met to review all results indicator historical data and targets and recommended an extension of all results indicator targets for FFY2019.

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 1

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/30/2019 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 1,762 |
| SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/30/2019 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b) |  |
| SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/30/2019 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c) | 24 |
| SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/30/2019 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d) | 351 |
| SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/30/2019 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e) | 4 |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out** | **Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 351 | 2,141 | 14.35% | 19.00% | 16.39% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)**

XXX

**If yes, provide justification for the changes below.**

XXX

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

XXX

**Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)**

XXX

**Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)**

XXX

**If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology**

XXX

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out | Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort | **FFY** **2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth**

Maine uses the same calculation as that used in 618 IDEA reporting: [ (The number of youth with IEPs ages 14 through 20 who exited special education due to dropping out / The number of youth with IEPs ages 14 through 20 who left high school for the reasons listed below) \* 100 ]. Students are counted as dropping out when identified with one of the following exit reasons: dropped out, status unknown, and moved, not known to be continuing. The reasons for which students with IEPs may have left school are: graduating with a regular high school diploma, reaching maximum age, dropping out, and death.

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)**

NO

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs below.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 2 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

1. Indicator 3A – Reserved
2. Participation rate for children with IEPs
3. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

**Measurement**

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Reporting Group Selection**

**Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 5** | **Grade 6** | **Grade 7** | **Grade 8** | **Grade 9** | **Grade 10** | **Grade 11** | **Grade 12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3-8 | X | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| **B** | High School |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| **C** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **D** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **E** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **F** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **G** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **H** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **I** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **J** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **K** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **L** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Historical Data: Reading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| A | Grade 3-8 | 2013 | Target >= | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% |
| A | Grade 3-8 | 98.10% | Actual | 98.10% | 92.96% | 90.37% | 90.60% | 96.62% |
| B | High School | 2013 | Target >= | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% |
| B | High School | 90.53% | Actual | 90.53% | 62.43% | 82.22% | 90.35% | 91.09% |
| C |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| C |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| D |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| D |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| E |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| E |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| F |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| F |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| G |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| G |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| H |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| H |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| I |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| I |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| J |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| J |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| L |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| L |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |

**Historical Data: Math**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| A | Grade 3-8 | 2013 | Target >= | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% |
| A | Grade 3-8 | 98.05% | Actual | 98.05% | 92.51% | 90.30% | 90.63% | 96.62% |
| B | High School | 2013 | Target >= | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% |
| B | High School | 90.58% | Actual | 90.58% | 61.32% | 82.25% | 90.35% | 91.09% |
| C |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| C |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| D |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| D |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| E |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| E |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| F |  |  | Target ≥ |  |  |  |  |  |
| F |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| G |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| G |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| H |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| H |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| I |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| I |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| J |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| J |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| L |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| L |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 3-8 | 98.00% | 98.00% |
| Reading | B >= | High School | 98.00% | 98.00% |
| Reading | C >= |  |  |  |
| Reading | D >= |  |  |  |
| Reading | E >= |  |  |  |
| Reading | F >= |  |  |  |
| Reading | G >= |  |  |  |
| Reading | H >= |  |  |  |
| Reading | I >= |  |  |  |
| Reading | J >= |  |  |  |
| Reading | K >= |  |  |  |
| Reading | L >= |  |  |  |
| Math | A >= | Grade 3-8 | 98.00% | 98.00% |
| Math | B >= | High School | 98.00% | 98.00% |
| Math | C >= |  |  |  |
| Math | D >= |  |  |  |
| Math | E >= |  |  |  |
| Math | F >= |  |  |  |
| Math | G >= |  |  |  |
| Math | H >= |  |  |  |
| Math | I >= |  |  |  |
| Math | J >= |  |  |  |
| Math | K >= |  |  |  |
| Math | L >= |  |  |  |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. Membership is specified in the federal regulations and a majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three to 20. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people: two parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26); an individual with a disability; a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative from the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. A majority of the members of the panel must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). Among the members is an individual who represents the SAP on the State Systemic Improvement Plan stakeholder group. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders. The director of the Maine DOE Office of Special Services met with the SAP during their quarterly meetings throughout FFY2018. Members were informed of department priorities and current issues and advice was sought from the membership for the Maine DOE to consider in legislation, rule-making, procedures and reporting. Topics included revisions to the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations, the State Systemic Improvement Plan, Significant Disproportionality Policy, and SPP/APR target-setting for FFY2019.Target-setting activities for the new SSIP consisted of series of meetings of the SAP membership in 2013 and 2014 during which members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. These meetings included input from the public. Past performance for each indicator in the first year with comparable consistent measurement with the baseline was identified. Possible targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years. Maine DOE staff members, including the director, data manager and SPP/APR coordinator, were available to answer any statistical or practical questions related to the indicators, past performance, or the analysis leading to suggestions of targets. SAP members discussed priorities and arrived at recommendations for targets for all results indicators (except B-17) for the life of the SPP. Additionally, in December, 2019, SAP members met to review all results indicator historical data and targets and recommended an extension of all results indicator targets for FFY2019.

**FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

04/08/2020

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs | 2,474 | 2,713 | 2,699 | 2,704 | 2,639 | 2,527 |  |  |  |  | 1,985 |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 444 | 322 | 259 | 313 | 295 | 305 |  |  |  |  | 562 |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 1,843 | 2,146 | 2,218 | 2,148 | 2,057 | 1,927 |  |  |  |  | 1,067 |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 108 | 120 | 139 | 117 | 148 | 132 |  |  |  |  | 123 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

04/08/2020

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs | 2,479 | 2,713 | 2,703 | 2,692 | 2,645 | 2,517 |  |  |  |  | 1,985 |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 444 | 321 | 256 | 312 | 299 | 302 |  |  |  |  | 563 |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 1,848 | 2,147 | 2,224 | 2,138 | 2,057 | 1,920 |  |  |  |  | 1,067 |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 108 | 120 | 140 | 116 | 149 | 132 |  |  |  |  | 123 |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3-8 | 15,756 | 15,041 | 96.62% | 98.00% | 95.46% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| **B** | High School | 1,985 | 1,752 | 91.09% | 98.00% | 88.26% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| **C** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **D** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **E** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **F** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **G** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **H** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **I** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **J** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **K** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **L** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3-8 | The reason for slippage is unclear. Participation for this group showed a large increase from 90.6% in FFY2016 to 96.62% in FFY2017 but showed a slight drop to 95.46% in FFY2018. These rates appear to be within the range of non-systemic year-to-year variability. Maine will continue to monitor these rates to determine if there is a systemic trend that indicates a reduction in participation over time. |
| **B** | High School | The reason for slippage is unclear. Participation for this group increased from 88.22% in FFY2015 to 90.35% in FFY2016 and to 91.09% in FFY2017 but showed a drop to 88.26% in FFY2018. The FFY2018 rate defies the trend toward increased participation seen during the previous 2 years, but it may be a product of non-systemic variability. Maine will monitor these rates to determine if there is a systemic trend that indicates a reduction in participation over time. |
| **C** |  | XXX |
| **D** |  | XXX |
| **E** |  | XXX |
| **F** |  | XXX |
| **G** |  | XXX |
| **H** |  | XXX |
| **I** |  | XXX |
| **J** |  | XXX |
| **K** |  | XXX |
| **L** |  | XXX |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3-8 | 15,749 | 15,033 | 96.62% | 98.00% | 95.45% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| **B** | High School | 1,985 | 1,753 | 91.09% | 98.00% | 88.31% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| **C** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **D** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **E** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **F** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **G** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **H** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **I** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **J** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **K** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **L** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3-8 | The reason for slippage is unclear. Math participation for this group mirrored the slight decrease in reading participation seen above. These rates appear to be within the range of non-systemic year-to-year variability. Maine will continue to monitor these rates to determine if there is a systemic trend that indicates a reduction in participation over time. |
| **B** | High School | The reason for slippage is unclear. Math participation for this group mirrored the increase in reading participation between FFY2015 and FFY2017 and the decrease in FFY2018. As with reading, the FFY2018 rate for math participation defies the trend toward increased participation seen during the previous 2 years, but it may be a product of non-systemic variability. Maine will monitor these rates to determine if there is a systemic trend that indicates a reduction in participation over time. |
| **C** |  | XXX |
| **D** |  | XXX |
| **E** |  | XXX |
| **F** |  | XXX |
| **G** |  | XXX |
| **H** |  | XXX |
| **I** |  | XXX |
| **J** |  | XXX |
| **K** |  | XXX |
| **L** |  | XXX |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

Student assessment data are available on the following wepage: https://www.maine.gov/doe/Testing\_Accountability/MECAS/results/reports/sped-assessment

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 3B - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 3B - Required Actions

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

1. Indicator 3A – Reserved
2. Participation rate for children with IEPs
3. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3C - Indicator Data

**Reporting Group Selection**

**Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 5** | **Grade 6** | **Grade 7** | **Grade 8** | **Grade 9** | **Grade 10** | **Grade 11** | **Grade 12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3-8 | X | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| **B** | HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| **C** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **D** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **E** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **F** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **G** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **H** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **I** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **J** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **K** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **L** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Historical Data: Reading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| A | Grade 3-8 | 2015 | Target >= | 35.00% | 35.00% | 45.00% | 60.00% | 75.00% |
| A | Grade 3-8 | 15.11% | Actual | 30.71% | 15.79% | 15.11% | 15.19% | 14.27% |
| B | HS | 2015 | Target >= | 20.00% | 20.00% | 30.00% | 50.00% | 70.00% |
| B | HS | 20.65% | Actual | 15.97% | 17.82% | 20.65% | 19.71% | 17.02% |
| C |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| C |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| D |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| D |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| E |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| E |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| F |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| F |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| G |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| G |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| H |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| H |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| I |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| I |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| J |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| J |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| L |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| L |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |

**Historical Data: Math**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| A | Grade 3-8 | 2015 | Target >= | 30.00% | 30.00% | 40.00% | 50.00% | 70.00% |
| A | Grade 3-8 | 12.33% | Actual | 26.02% | 12.68% | 12.33% | 11.69% | 11.05% |
| B | HS | 2015 | Target >= | 15.00% | 15.00% | 25.00% | 45.00% | 70.00% |
| B | HS | 10.34% | Actual | 15.69% | 9.23% | 10.34% | 9.80% | 8.59% |
| C |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| C |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| D |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| D |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| E |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| E |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| F |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| F |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| G |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| G |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| H |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| H |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| I |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| I |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| J |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| J |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| K |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| L |  |  | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| L |  |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 3-8 | 90.00% | 90.00% |
| Reading | B >= | HS | 90.00% | 90.00% |
| Reading | C >= |  |  |  |
| Reading | D >= |  |  |  |
| Reading | E >= |  |  |  |
| Reading | F >= |  |  |  |
| Reading | G >= |  |  |  |
| Reading | H >= |  |  |  |
| Reading | I >= |  |  |  |
| Reading | J >= |  |  |  |
| Reading | K >= |  |  |  |
| Reading | L >= |  |  |  |
| Math | A >= | Grade 3-8 | 90.00% | 90.00% |
| Math | B >= | HS | 90.00% | 90.00% |
| Math | C >= |  |  |  |
| Math | D >= |  |  |  |
| Math | E >= |  |  |  |
| Math | F >= |  |  |  |
| Math | G >= |  |  |  |
| Math | H >= |  |  |  |
| Math | I >= |  |  |  |
| Math | J >= |  |  |  |
| Math | K >= |  |  |  |
| Math | L >= |  |  |  |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. Membership is specified in the federal regulations and a majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three to 20. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people: two parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26); an individual with a disability; a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative from the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. A majority of the members of the panel must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). Among the members is an individual who represents the SAP on the State Systemic Improvement Plan stakeholder group. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders. The director of the Maine DOE Office of Special Services met with the SAP during their quarterly meetings throughout FFY2018. Members were informed of department priorities and current issues and advice was sought from the membership for the Maine DOE to consider in legislation, rule-making, procedures and reporting. Topics included revisions to the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations, the State Systemic Improvement Plan, Significant Disproportionality Policy, and SPP/APR target-setting for FFY2019.Target-setting activities for the new SSIP consisted of series of meetings of the SAP membership in 2013 and 2014 during which members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. These meetings included input from the public. Past performance for each indicator in the first year with comparable consistent measurement with the baseline was identified. Possible targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years. Maine DOE staff members, including the director, data manager and SPP/APR coordinator, were available to answer any statistical or practical questions related to the indicators, past performance, or the analysis leading to suggestions of targets. SAP members discussed priorities and arrived at recommendations for targets for all results indicators (except B-17) for the life of the SPP. Additionally, in December, 2019, SAP members met to review all results indicator historical data and targets and recommended an extension of all results indicator targets for FFY2019.

**FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/08/2020

**Reading Proficiency Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned | 2,395 | 2,588 | 2,616 | 2,578 | 2,500 | 2,364 |  |  |  |  | 1,752 |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 193 | 136 | 97 | 110 | 102 | 86 |  |  |  |  | 67 |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 223 | 342 | 274 | 286 | 289 | 284 |  |  |  |  | 155 |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level | 51 | 44 | 55 | 56 | 82 | 71 |  |  |  |  | 82 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/08/2020

**Math Proficiency Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned | 2,400 | 2,588 | 2,620 | 2,566 | 2,505 | 2,354 |  |  |  |  | 1,753 |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 161 | 94 | 49 | 44 | 39 | 37 |  |  |  |  | 26 |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 219 | 192 | 106 | 95 | 93 | 87 |  |  |  |  | 47 |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level | 52 | 59 | 64 | 48 | 67 | 71 |  |  |  |  | 79 |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned** | **Number of Children with IEPs Proficient** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3-8 | 15,041 | 2,781 | 14.27% | 90.00% | 18.49% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| **B** | HS | 1,752 | 304 | 17.02% | 90.00% | 17.35% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| **C** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **D** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **E** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **F** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **G** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **H** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **I** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **J** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **K** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **L** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3-8 | XXX |
| **B** | HS | XXX |
| **C** |  | XXX |
| **D** |  | XXX |
| **E** |  | XXX |
| **F** |  |  |
| **G** |  | XXX |
| **H** |  | XXX |
| **I** |  | XXX |
| **J** |  | XXX |
| **K** |  | XXX |
| **L** |  | XXX |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned** | **Number of Children with IEPs Proficient** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3-8 | 15,033 | 1,577 | 11.05% | 90.00% | 10.49% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| **B** | HS | 1,753 | 152 | 8.59% | 90.00% | 8.67% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| **C** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **D** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **E** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **F** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **G** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **H** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **I** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **J** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **K** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **L** |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3-8 | XXX |
| **B** | HS | XXX |
| **C** |  | XXX |
| **D** |  | XXX |
| **E** |  | XXX |
| **F** |  | XXX |
| **G** |  | XXX |
| **H** |  | XXX |
| **I** |  | XXX |
| **J** |  | XXX |
| **K** |  | XXX |
| **L** |  | XXX |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

Student assessment data are available on the following wepage: https://www.maine.gov/doe/Testing\_Accountability/MECAS/results/reports/sped-assessment

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 3C - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 3C - Required Actions

# Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

1. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

* The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
* The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | 2016 | 0.00% |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 1.57% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. Membership is specified in the federal regulations and a majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three to 20. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people: two parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26); an individual with a disability; a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative from the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. A majority of the members of the panel must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). Among the members is an individual who represents the SAP on the State Systemic Improvement Plan stakeholder group. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders. The director of the Maine DOE Office of Special Services met with the SAP during their quarterly meetings throughout FFY2018. Members were informed of department priorities and current issues and advice was sought from the membership for the Maine DOE to consider in legislation, rule-making, procedures and reporting. Topics included revisions to the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations, the State Systemic Improvement Plan, Significant Disproportionality Policy, and SPP/APR target-setting for FFY2019.Target-setting activities for the new SSIP consisted of series of meetings of the SAP membership in 2013 and 2014 during which members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. These meetings included input from the public. Past performance for each indicator in the first year with comparable consistent measurement with the baseline was identified. Possible targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years. Maine DOE staff members, including the director, data manager and SPP/APR coordinator, were available to answer any statistical or practical questions related to the indicators, past performance, or the analysis leading to suggestions of targets. SAP members discussed priorities and arrived at recommendations for targets for all results indicators (except B-17) for the life of the SPP. Additionally, in December, 2019, SAP members met to review all results indicator historical data and targets and recommended an extension of all results indicator targets for FFY2019.

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

64

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of districts that met the State’s minimum n size** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 3 | 197 | 1.57% | 0.00% | 1.52% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))**

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

The following decision rules are used to determine if there is a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for children with disabilities: The district must have a minimum of 10 students with IEPs enrolled. For districts meeting the n size threshold of 10, the number of students suspended or expelled over 10 days must be greater than 1 and the rate of suspension/expulsion over 10 days must be more than 3 standard deviations above the State's rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for students with disabilities.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using FFY17- FFY18 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

Data from the 2017-2018 report of children with disabilities subject to disciplinary removal were examined to determine if significant discrepancies were occurring in the rates of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days. For districts identified with significant discrepancies, Maine DOE reviews specific files from each district with a compliance instrument to test compliance of each student file or policy document for 36 items. The purpose of this review is to ensure that districts are properly developing and implementing IEPs, use positive behavioral interventions and supports, and include procedural safeguards as outlined in 34 C.F.R. 300.170 (b). Each instance of noncompliance is required to be corrected and the Maine DOE requires the district to revise their policies and procedures to comply with IDEA and Maine Unified Special Education Regulations. Maine did not identify noncompliance with the Part B requirements as a result of the reviews.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements*.***

XXX

**Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008*.***

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 4A - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

## 4A - Required Actions

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

1. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons

* The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
* The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:**

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | 2016 | 0.00% |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

64

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity** | **Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements** | **Number of districts that met the State’s minimum n size** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 0 | 197 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable**

XXX

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

The following decision rules are used to determine if there is a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days by race/ethnicity among children with disabilities: The district must have a minimum of 10 students of any race/ethnicity with IEPs enrolled. For districts meeting the n size threshold of 10, the number of students of any race/ethnicity suspended or expelled over 10 days must be greater than 1, and the rate of suspensions/expulsions over 10 days must be more than 3 standard deviations above the State's rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for students with disabilities.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

Indicator 4A data were disaggregated by race/ethnicity. None of the districts exhibited a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity in the rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days. If a district had exhibited a significant discrepancy, Maine would have reviewed the specific files from each district with a compliance instrument to test compliance of each student file or policy document for 36 items. The purpose of this review is to ensure that districts are properly developing and implementing IEPs, use positive behavioral interventions and supports, and include procedural safeguards as outlined in 34 C.F.R. 300.170 (b). Each instance of noncompliance is required to be corrected and the Maine DOE requires the district to revise their policies and procedures to comply with IDEA and Maine Unified Special Education Regulations.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**If YES, select one of the following:**

**The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements*.***

XXX

**Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008*.***

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 4B - OSEP Response

## 4B- Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

1. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
2. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
3. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| A | 2005 | Target >= | 65.00% | 66.00% | 67.00% | 68.00% | 69.00% |
| A | 57.10% | Data | 55.67% | 56.41% | 56.69% | 56.58% | 56.41% |
| B | 2005 | Target <= | 9.00% | 9.00% | 9.00% | 9.00% | 9.00% |
| B | 11.20% | Data | 10.71% | 10.70% | 10.78% | 10.88% | 10.33% |
| C | 2005 | Target <= | 3.10% | 3.10% | 3.10% | 3.10% | 3.10% |
| C | 3.50% | Data | 3.33% | 3.10% | 3.13% | 3.24% | 3.07% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 70.00% | 70.00% |
| Target B <= | 9.00% | 9.00% |
| Target C <= | 3.10% | 3.10% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. Membership is specified in the federal regulations and a majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three to 20. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people: two parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26); an individual with a disability; a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative from the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. A majority of the members of the panel must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). Among the members is an individual who represents the SAP on the State Systemic Improvement Plan stakeholder group. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders. The director of the Maine DOE Office of Special Services met with the SAP during their quarterly meetings throughout FFY2018. Members were informed of department priorities and current issues and advice was sought from the membership for the Maine DOE to consider in legislation, rule-making, procedures and reporting. Topics included revisions to the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations, the State Systemic Improvement Plan, Significant Disproportionality Policy, and SPP/APR target-setting for FFY2019.Target-setting activities for the new SSIP consisted of series of meetings of the SAP membership in 2013 and 2014 during which members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. These meetings included input from the public. Past performance for each indicator in the first year with comparable consistent measurement with the baseline was identified. Possible targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years. Maine DOE staff members, including the director, data manager and SPP/APR coordinator, were available to answer any statistical or practical questions related to the indicators, past performance, or the analysis leading to suggestions of targets. SAP members discussed priorities and arrived at recommendations for targets for all results indicators (except B-17) for the life of the SPP. Additionally, in December, 2019, SAP members met to review all results indicator historical data and targets and recommended an extension of all results indicator targets for FFY2019.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/11/2019 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 | 30,740 |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/11/2019 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 17,066 |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/11/2019 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 3,195 |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/11/2019 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools | 910 |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/11/2019 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities | 127 |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/11/2019 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 27 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Provide an explanation below**

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

|  | **Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 17,066 | 30,740 | 56.41% | 70.00% | 55.52% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 3,195 | 30,740 | 10.33% | 9.00% | 10.39% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 1,064 | 30,740 | 3.07% | 3.10% | 3.46% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

|  | **Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

NO

**Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.**

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | XXX |
| **B** | XXX |
| **C** | The reason for slippage in Category C is unclear. The percentage of children placed in this educational environment increased from 3.13% in FFY2015 to 3.24% in FFY2016 then decreased to 3.07% in FFY2017 and increased to 3.46% in FFY2018. The FFY2018 percentage is the highest among the past several years, but it may be a product of non-systemic year-to-year variability. Maine will continue to monitor these rates to determine if there is a systemic trend that indicates an increase in separate school, residential facility, or homebound/hospital placements over time. |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.The State's FFY 2018 data represent slippage from the FFY 2017 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2018 target for this indicator. The State did not, as required, provide the reasons for slippage.

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

1. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
2. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.**

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| A | 2011 | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| A |  | Data |  |  | 75.20% | 74.69% | 68.32% |
| B | 2011 | Target <= |  |  |  |  |  |
| B |  | Data |  |  | 0.74% | 12.87% | 14.98% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target A >= |  |  |
| Target B <= |  |  |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. Membership is specified in the federal regulations and a majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three to 20. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people: two parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26); an individual with a disability; a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative from the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. A majority of the members of the panel must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). Among the members is an individual who represents the SAP on the State Systemic Improvement Plan stakeholder group. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders. The director of the Maine DOE Office of Special Services met with the SAP during their quarterly meetings throughout FFY2018. Members were informed of department priorities and current issues and advice was sought from the membership for the Maine DOE to consider in legislation, rule-making, procedures and reporting. Topics included revisions to the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations, the State Systemic Improvement Plan, Significant Disproportionality Policy, and SPP/APR target-setting for FFY2019.Target-setting activities for the new SSIP consisted of series of meetings of the SAP membership in 2013 and 2014 during which members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. These meetings included input from the public. Past performance for each indicator in the first year with comparable consistent measurement with the baseline was identified. Possible targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years. Maine DOE staff members, including the director, data manager and SPP/APR coordinator, were available to answer any statistical or practical questions related to the indicators, past performance, or the analysis leading to suggestions of targets. SAP members discussed priorities and arrived at recommendations for targets for all results indicators (except B-17) for the life of the SPP. Additionally, in December, 2019, SAP members met to review all results indicator historical data and targets and recommended an extension of all results indicator targets for FFY2019.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/11/2019 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 | 3,642 |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/11/2019 | a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 1,678 |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/11/2019 | b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 304 |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/11/2019 | b2. Number of children attending separate school | 550 |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/11/2019 | b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 2 |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

|  | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 1,678 | 3,642 | 68.32% |  | 46.07% | N/A | N/A |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 856 | 3,642 | 14.98% |  | 23.50% | N/A | N/A |

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

YES

**Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above*.***

In Maine, children ages 3 through 5 are educated in two separate systems (Child Development Services (CDS) and Maine Department of Education (Maine DOE)), and Maine reports targets and data for the two environments separately. The historical data and targets are provided in the attachment, and the FFY2018 data and targets are reported separately below.Maine DOE: Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 = 1,524a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program = 1,501b1. Number of children attending separate special education class = 4b2. Number of children attending separate school = 17b3. Number of children attending residential facility = 2A. Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program = 1, 501Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 = 1,524FFY2017 Data = 98.69%; FFY2018 Target >= 99.20%; FFY2018 Data = 98.49 %B. Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility = 23Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 = 1,524FFY2017 Data = 1.17%; FFY2018 Target < 0.80%; FFY2018 Data = 1.5%Explanation of Slippage: The reason for slippage in Category B is unclear. The percentage of children placed in a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility decreased from 1.37% (21 students) in FFY2016 to 1.17% (16 students) in FFY2017 then increased to 1.5% (23 students) in FFY2018. There is no clear historical trend toward an increase in the percentage of students placed in this educational environment category, and given the low number of students represented by these percentages, these values may be a product of non-systemic year-to-year variability. Maine will continue to monitor these rates to determine if there is a systemic trend that indicates an increase in separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility placements over time.Maine CDS:Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 = 2,312a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program = 1,428b1. Number of children attending separate special education class = 583b2. Number of children attending separate school = 301b3. Number of children attending residential facility = 0A. Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program = 1,428Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 = 2,312FFY2017 Data = 47.69%; FFY2018 Target >= 53.50%; FFY2018 Data = 61.67%B. Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility = 884Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 = 2,312FFY2017 Data = 24.37%; FFY2018 Target < 12.00%; FFY2018 Data = 38.24%Explanation of Slippage in Category B: Based on Maine 619 implementing a new data system and providing intensive TA over the last 2 years on preschool educational environments, the change in data for B6 more accurately reflects the different educational environments that children 3-5 receive special education services in. In addition, Maine continues to see a trend of a high percentage of children eligible under speech or language impairment and require only speech and language services. Due to the individual needs of the child, that service may happen in a service provider location/ outside of a classroom.

**Provide reasons for slippage for A**

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | XXX |
| **B** | XXX |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 6 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the target for preschool ages 3-5, but OSEP cannot accept the target for school aged children because the State's end target for FFY 2019 do not reflect improvement over the baseline data. The State must revise its FFY 2019 target for school aged children to reflect improvement.The State's FFY 2018 data represent slippage from the FFY 2017 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2018 target for this indicator. The State did not, as required, provide the reasons for slippage for school-aged.

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

1. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
2. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
3. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

1. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
2. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
3. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

1. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
2. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
3. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
4. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
5. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:**

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:**The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.**

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| A1 | 2008 | Target >= | 64.00% | 64.00% | 64.00% | 64.00% | 64.00% |
| A1 | 63.10% | Data | 60.04% | 71.79% | 69.42% | 72.36% | 67.54% |
| A2 | 2008 | Target >= | 38.00% | 38.00% | 38.00% | 38.00% | 38.00% |
| A2 | 37.00% | Data | 52.46% | 54.50% | 49.21% | 43.24% | 40.91% |
| B1 | 2008 | Target >= | 67.00% | 67.00% | 67.00% | 67.00% | 67.00% |
| B1 | 65.50% | Data | 68.55% | 72.87% | 75.37% | 75.30% | 69.16% |
| B2 | 2008 | Target >= | 36.00% | 36.00% | 36.00% | 36.00% | 36.00% |
| B2 | 35.40% | Data | 50.69% | 50.40% | 51.04% | 42.31% | 40.46% |
| C1 | 2008 | Target >= | 59.00% | 59.00% | 59.00% | 59.00% | 59.00% |
| C1 | 58.30% | Data | 55.05% | 66.38% | 66.88% | 68.74% | 64.53% |
| C2 | 2008 | Target >= | 52.00% | 52.00% | 52.00% | 52.00% | 52.00% |
| C2 | 51.00% | Data | 68.71% | 69.20% | 67.48% | 60.57% | 55.46% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target A1 >= | 65.00% | 65.00% |
| Target A2 >= | 39.00% | 39.00% |
| Target B1 >= | 68.00% | 68.00% |
| Target B2 >= | 37.00% | 37.00% |
| Target C1 >= | 60.00% | 60.00% |
| Target C2 >= | 53.00% | 53.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. Membership is specified in the federal regulations and a majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three to 20. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people: two parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26); an individual with a disability; a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative from the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. A majority of the members of the panel must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). Among the members is an individual who represents the SAP on the State Systemic Improvement Plan stakeholder group. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders. The director of the Maine DOE Office of Special Services met with the SAP during their quarterly meetings throughout FFY2018. Members were informed of department priorities and current issues and advice was sought from the membership for the Maine DOE to consider in legislation, rule-making, procedures and reporting. Topics included revisions to the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations, the State Systemic Improvement Plan, Significant Disproportionality Policy, and SPP/APR target-setting for FFY2019.Target-setting activities for the new SSIP consisted of series of meetings of the SAP membership in 2013 and 2014 during which members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. These meetings included input from the public. Past performance for each indicator in the first year with comparable consistent measurement with the baseline was identified. Possible targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years. Maine DOE staff members, including the director, data manager and SPP/APR coordinator, were available to answer any statistical or practical questions related to the indicators, past performance, or the analysis leading to suggestions of targets. SAP members discussed priorities and arrived at recommendations for targets for all results indicators (except B-17) for the life of the SPP. Additionally, in December, 2019, SAP members met to review all results indicator historical data and targets and recommended an extension of all results indicator targets for FFY2019.

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

1,682

**Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

|  | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 7 | 0.42% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 416 | 24.73% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 611 | 36.33% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 366 | 21.76% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 282 | 16.77% |

|  | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 977 | 1,400 | 67.54% | 65.00% | 69.79% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 648 | 1,682 | 40.91% | 39.00% | 38.53% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)**

|  | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 9 | 0.54% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 372 | 22.12% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 613 | 36.44% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 435 | 25.86% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 253 | 15.04% |

|  | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 1,048 | 1,429 | 69.16% | 68.00% | 73.34% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.*Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 688 | 1,682 | 40.46% | 37.00% | 40.90% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

|  | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 14 | 0.83% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 323 | 19.20% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 404 | 24.02% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 328 | 19.50% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 613 | 36.44% |

|  | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. | 732 | 1,069 | 64.53% | 60.00% | 68.48% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. | 941 | 1,682 | 55.46% | 53.00% | 55.95% | Met Target | No Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A1** | XXX |
| **A2** | Slippage for A2 can be attributed to the higher needs of children requiring special education 3-5 in Maine during this reporting year. Most notably, there was an increase in the eligibility categories of multiple disabilities and other health impairment. |
| **B1** | XXX |
| **B2** | XXX |
| **C1** | XXX |
| **C2** | XXX |

**Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)**

YES

**Please explain why the State did not include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.**

|  | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |
| If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? |  |
| If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan |  |

**Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.**

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

**If no, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”**

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

Maine uses the ECO process for COS. The form has been built into the statewide system with validations to ensure every child has a COS form on file at entry and at exit from EI services if they have been in services for more than six months.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FF 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8: Parent involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling **of parents from whom response is requested** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 8 - Indicator Data

|  | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? | YES |
| If yes, will you be providing the data for preschool children separately? | NO |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. Membership is specified in the federal regulations and a majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three to 20. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people: two parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26); an individual with a disability; a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative from the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. A majority of the members of the panel must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). Among the members is an individual who represents the SAP on the State Systemic Improvement Plan stakeholder group. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders. The director of the Maine DOE Office of Special Services met with the SAP during their quarterly meetings throughout FFY2018. Members were informed of department priorities and current issues and advice was sought from the membership for the Maine DOE to consider in legislation, rule-making, procedures and reporting. Topics included revisions to the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations, the State Systemic Improvement Plan, Significant Disproportionality Policy, and SPP/APR target-setting for FFY2019.Target-setting activities for the new SSIP consisted of series of meetings of the SAP membership in 2013 and 2014 during which members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. These meetings included input from the public. Past performance for each indicator in the first year with comparable consistent measurement with the baseline was identified. Possible targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years. Maine DOE staff members, including the director, data manager and SPP/APR coordinator, were available to answer any statistical or practical questions related to the indicators, past performance, or the analysis leading to suggestions of targets. SAP members discussed priorities and arrived at recommendations for targets for all results indicators (except B-17) for the life of the SPP. Additionally, in December, 2019, SAP members met to review all results indicator historical data and targets and recommended an extension of all results indicator targets for FFY2019.

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | 2006 | 87.40% |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target >= | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% |
| Data | 93.00% | 93.49% | 93.95% | 91.61% | 92.94% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 91.00% | 91.00% |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities** | **Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities** | | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 718 | | 803 | 92.94% | 91.00% | 89.41% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

13,161

**Percentage of respondent parents**

6.10%

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The reason for slippage is unclear, but a degree of year-to-year variability may be due different cohorts being monitored each year; LEAs are assigned to cohorts that are monitored on a four year rotation. Maine will continue to monitor these rates to determine if there is a systemic trend that indicates slippage over time.

**Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.**

For the combined (school-age and preschool) percentage, the number of school-age and preschool respondents who indicated that schools facilitated parent involvement were summed and then divided by the sum of all school-age and preschool respondents. Preschool data (age 3-5) were gathered from a census of all Child Development Services sites. School-aged data were collected through monitoring activities. LEAs are assigned to cohorts that are monitored on a four year rotation, ensuring that each LEA is monitored once every four years. The data for Child Development Services (CDS) (pre-school) and DOE are reported jointly for this indicator because the targets and baseline have been set for combined CDS and DOE data. However, Maine additionally reports CDS and DOE disaggregations - the FFY2018 data, both combined and disaggregated, are reported below.Measurement:Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.Overall (Combined) = [(586 + 132) / (664 + 139)]\*100= 89.41%DOE (School Age) = (586 / 664) \* 100 = 88.25%CDS = (132 / 139) \* 100 = 94.96%

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Preschool | XXX | Target >= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| Preschool | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| School age | XXX | Target >= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| School age | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | XXX | XXX |
| Target B >= | XXX | XXX |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately**

|  | **Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities** | **Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Preschool | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **School age** | **XXX** | **XXX** | **XXX** | **XXX** | **XXX** | **XXX** | **XXX** |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**The number of School-Age parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

XXX

**Percentage of respondent School-Age parents**

XXX

|  | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | YES |
| If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? | NO |
| If yes, provide sampling plan. | XXX |

**Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.**

Part B 619 data are not based on a sample, they are collected via a census, while school-age data are collected through monitoring activities (sample). School-age data were gathered from a cohort consisting of 1/4 of Maine's school districts. Preschool data (age 3-5) were gathered from a census of all Child Development Services sites.Maine DOE provided the electronic link to the survey to all monitored LEAs and the LEAs provided the link to all parents of students with IEPs in the LEA. 12,006 survey invitations were provided to parents of Part B school-aged children, and 664 survey responses were received. The percentage of parents with a child receiving special education services who reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities was 88.25%. Analyses of the sample's representativeness of the population of monitored districts were conducted for gender, age group, and race/ethnicity. Respondent data across all categories were found to be represented in the sample at least to the extent that they existed in the population or were within 5% of the population values.CDS preschool data were collected via a census. All families of children receiving services through the nine regional sites received a text message or email with a link to the survey. 1,155 Part B (619) families were contacted to complete the survey and 139 responded. The percentage of parents with a child receiving special education services who reported that the schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities was 94.96%. In reviewing the data, the CDS State IEU has determined the response group is representative of the CDS system.

|  | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |
| If yes, provide a copy of the survey. | XXX |
| The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. | YES |

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.**

School-age data was gathered from a cohort consisting of 1/4 of Maine's school districts. Preschool data (age 3-5) were gathered from a census of all Child Development Services sites.Maine DOE provided the electronic link to the survey to all monitored LEAs and the LEAs provided the link to all parents of students with IEPs in the LEA. 12,006 survey invitations were provided to parents of Part B school-aged children, and 664 survey responses were received. The percentage of parents with a child receiving special education services who reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities was 88.25%. Analyses of the respondents' representativeness of the population of monitored districts were conducted for gender, age group, and race/ethnicity. Respondent data across all categories were found to be represented in the target population of children receiving special education services at least to the extent that they existed in the target population or were within 5% of the population values.CDS preschool data were collected via a census. All families of children receiving services through the nine regional sites received a text message or email with a link to the survey. 1,155 Part B (619) families were contacted to complete the survey and 139 responded. The percentage of parents with a child receiving special education services who reported that the schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities was 94.96%. In reviewing the data, the CDS State IEU has determined the response group is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the CDS system.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 8 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target. In its description of its FFY 2018 data, the State did not address whether the response group was representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State.

## 8 - Required Actions

# Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.**

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | 2016 | 0.00% |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

124

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of districts that met the State’s minimum n and/or cell size** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 0 | 140 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

Disproportionate representation is defined as a significant difference between the identification rates of students with disabilities by race/ethnic proportion and the proportionate representation of the race/ethnicity overall within the district. A significant difference is defined as a risk ratio and an alternate risk ratio greater than or equal to 3 when comparing the risk of special education identification of students of a given race/ethnicity to the risk of special education identification of students of all other races/ethnicities. One year of data is used in the calculations. Multiple risk ratio measures and cell and n size criteria are used because the counts of students belonging to various racial/ethnic groups in Maine’s districts often are very small. The cell size and n size of an assessed racial/ethnic group in special education must be at least 10 and 30, respectively, and a comparison group of any other racial/ethnic group in the district must be at least 10.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.**

No districts exhibited disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education. Therefore, there was no review to determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 9 - OSEP Response

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below**

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | 2016 | 0.00% |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

135

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of districts that met the State’s minimum n and/or cell size** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 0 | 129 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

Disproportionate representation is defined as a significant difference between the rates of students identified for specific disability categories by race/ethnic proportion and the proportionate representation of the race/ethnicity overall within the district. A significant difference is defined as a risk ratio and an alternate risk ratio greater than or equal to 3 when comparing the risk of the identification of students of a given race/ethnicity in a disability category to the risk of identification of students of all other races/ethnicities. One year of data is used in the calculations. Multiple risk ratio measures and cell and n size criteria are used because the counts of students belonging to various racial/ethnic groups in Maine’s districts often are very small. The cell size and n size of an assessed racial/ethnic group in a disability category must be at least 10 and 30, respectively, and a comparison group of any other racial/ethnic group in the district must be at least 10.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.**

No districts exhibited disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories. Therefore, there was no review to determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 10 - OSEP Response

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: Child Find

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations.

**Measurement**

1. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
2. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

**Instructions**

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child’s previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | 2012 | 86.00% |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 83.24% | 84.08% | 83.02% | 91.24% | 92.65% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

| **(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received** | **(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 724 | 675 | 92.65% | 100% | 93.23% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage**

XXX

**Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)**

49

**Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.**

In Maine, children ages 3 through 5 are educated in two separate systems (Child Development Services (CDS) and Maine Department of Education (Maine DOE)). Children ages 3 through 5 served by CDS must be evaluated within 60 days, while school aged children ages 5 - 20 must be evaluated within 45 days. Therefore, the child find counts and analyses are reported separately below. Child Development Services (CDS):(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received = 430(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days = 398Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who were evaluated within 60 days = [ (398 / 430) \* 100 ] = 92.56%Reason for DelayCDS (no delay reason was given and/or delay was caused by regional site/staff) = 11Provider = 21Days Beyond Timeline61-75 = 13Over 75 = 19Maine DOE:(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received = 294(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days = 277Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who were evaluated within 60 days = [ (277 / 294) \* 100 ] = 94.22%The 53 LEAs monitored received 294 parental consents for evaluation within the 30% of educational files reviewed. As indicated above, 277 evaluations were completed within the 45 school-day timeline or within an allowable extension of time pursuant to Federal Regulations and Maine Unified Special Education Regulations (MUSER). Acceptable reasons for exceptions to the timeline are those that are beyond the LEA's control, including repeated parent failure or refusal to produce the child for evaluation, excessive child absences, documented delays in making contact with a parent to schedule the evaluation, documented parent request for a delay, or the child enrolled in the LEA after parental consent was received in another LEA but before the evaluation could be completed. All 17 students included in (a) but not included in (b) have completed initial evaluations, but they were not within the state-established timeline. The delays for these students ranged from 2 to 40 days. Reasons for these delays included lack of personnel resources to schedule and/or complete evaluation, the external evaluator failed to meet evaluation timelines, or the child was not available due to school activities.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

**What is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).**

In Maine, children ages 3 through 5 are educated in two separate systems (Child Development Services (CDS) and Maine Department of Education (Maine DOE)). Children ages 3 through 5 served by CDS must be evaluated within 60 days, while school aged children ages 5 - 20 must be evaluated within 45 days. Therefore, the child find counts and analyses are reported separately above. Acceptable reasons for exceptions to the timeline are those that are beyond the LEA's control, including repeated parent failure or refusal to produce the child for evaluation, excessive child absences, documented delays in making contact with a parent to schedule the evaluation, documented parent request for a delay, or the child enrolled in the LEA after parental consent was received in another LEA but before the evaluation could be completed.

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

Data-collection methods differ between students served under Child Development Services (CDS, which serves children ages 3-5) and school-aged students (age 5 and above).Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Data were collected through monitoring of the 9 regional CDS sites. All evaluations and eligibility determinations made between March 1, 2019 and June 30, 2019 were reviewed for timeliness. A total of 430 records were reviewed.School Aged (ages 5-20): The data for this indicator are monitoring data. LEAs are assigned to cohorts that are monitored on a four year rotation ensuring that each LEA is monitored once every four years. Initial evaluation data were collected from the 53 LEAs that were monitored during FFY2018. LEAs submit the following materials:1. evidence of signed parental consent,2. completed evaluations for initial evaluations occurring during the 2018-19 monitoring period,3. school calendars for evidence of “student” days and “no student” days, and4. reasons for delay of completion of initial evaluations. LEAs are required to provide evidence of accepted reasons for delay.The monitoring period is selected to ensure there are at least 45 school days between the date parental consent was received and the date evaluations were completed prior to submission due date. For larger LEAs this is a sample of initial evaluations occurring during the monitoring period. For smaller LEAs the submission consists of all the initial evaluations for which parental consent was received during the monitoring period. Initial evaluation data is also obtained during site visits, during which 10% of the identified students’ files are reviewed. Data collected on students whose files are randomly selected for on site review and received initial evaluation during the 2018-19 school year are identical to that submitted for desk audit; signed parental consent received by the LEA, completed evaluations and school calendar. Data are reviewed by the public school program monitoring team and checked for accuracy and inter-observer reliability.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 45 | 45 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Children Evaluated Within 60 Days:Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2017 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.301(c)(1) (achieved 100% compliance) and 34 CFR §§300.301(d) (exceptions to the timeline) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the regional site, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).School-Aged (ages 5-20): Children aged 5-20 Evaluated within the State-Established Timeline of 45 Days: Prior to considering any finding from FFY2017 corrected, Maine DOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b), (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Children Evaluated Within 60 Days:CDS was able to verify that an evaluation and initial IEP meeting were conducted for each child aged 3-5 for whom consent was received, although late. Specifically, to verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from, performed on-site file reviews, and verified subsequent data submitted through regional site self-assessments and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance varied based on the level of noncompliance identified in the program. In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, CDS State IEU also complied with the requirements to account for all instances of noncompliance identified through its database as well as on-site monitoring and other monitoring procedures; identify the level, location (regional site), and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any regional site with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit corrective action plans (CAPs). CDS State IEU and the regional site created the CAPs. These activities ranged from providing staff training, attending required TA, submitting monthly reports to the CDS State IEU and completing CAP check-in calls with the CDS State IEU.School-Aged (ages 5-20): Children aged 5-20 Evaluated within the State-Established Timeline of 45 Days:To verify that each LEA correctly implemented the requirements, Maine DOE reviewed and verified subsequent updated data submitted by the LEAs through corrective activities. LEAs were required to develop a plan for monitoring in the LEA to meet initial evaluation timelines. LEAs were to provide training on Child Find requirements and timelines, including the requirement to conduct an initial evaluation within 45 school days of receipt of parental consent to evaluate, and to use the LEAs timeline monitoring plan. LEAs were required to submit the following evidence: 1) outline of training, attendance at training, training plan, and 2) five parental consent to evaluate forms and evidence of date evaluation(s) received by the LEA. The time period within which each LEA with noncompliance was required to demonstrate 100% compliance was within one year of identification of noncompliance. All findings of noncompliance were demonstrated and verified as meeting 100% compliance within the one year of the identification of non-compliance, unless the child was no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. The monitoring team was able to verify that the evaluations were conducted for each school-aged 5-20 child for whom consent was received, although outside of the required 45 school day timeline. Evidence for the findings of noncompliance, including paper and digital copies of evaluations and written notices, were submitted to the Maine DOE and the content was verified by members of the monitoring team ensuring all evaluations met the criteria for Indicator 11.

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

1. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
2. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
3. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
4. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
5. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
6. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

**Instructions**

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.**

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | 2005 | 97.00% |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 98.89% | 99.33% | 99.67% | 81.62% | 80.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 362 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 24 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 192 |
| d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied. | 66 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | 58 |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. | 0 |

|  | **Numerator**  (c) | **Denominator**  (a-b-d-e-f) | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 192 | 214 | 80.00% | 100% | 89.72% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e,or f**

22

**Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.**

Days beyond Number of Children0-15 416-30 631-60 860+ 4Reasons for Delay Number of ChildrenCDS 14Contracted provider 8

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

Data were collected from the State database for all children for the reporting period of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019. Findings of noncomplaince were made based on a review of these data.Children and families in Maine do not have the option to continue early intervention services after age 3.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 43 | 43 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

Prior to considering any finding from FFY2017 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the regional site, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

To verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent, performed on-site file reviews and verified subsequent data submitted through regional site self-assessments and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance varied based on the level of noncompliance identified in the program.CDS was also able to verify that each child referred by Part C, prior to age 3, who was found eligible for Part B, subsequently had an IEP developed, although late.In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, CDS State IEU also complied with the requirements to account for all instances of noncompliance identified through its database as well as on-site monitoring and other monitoring procedures; identify the level, location (regional site), and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any regional site with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit CAPs. CDS State IEU and the regional site created the CAPs. These activities included providing staff training, attending required TA, submitting monthly reports to the CDS State IEU and completing CAP check-in calls with the CDS State IEU.

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - Required Actions

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Secondary transition: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

**Instructions**

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | 2012 | 36.00% |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 63.36% | 54.29% | 88.96% | 94.38% | 95.12% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition** | **Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 166 | 171 | 95.12% | 100% | 97.08% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

LEAs are assigned to cohorts that are monitored on a four year rotation, ensuring that each LEA is monitored once every four years. The data for this indicator reflect direct monitoring data. Postsecondary transition data were collected from the 53 LEAs that were monitored during FFY2018. Records for 30% of children receiving special education services in the monitored LEAs were reviewed through monitoring activities. The LEAs in the monitoring cohort performed a self-assessment of the records of 20% of their students receiving special education, and submitted the self-assessment to the Maine DOE. Maine DOE monitoring staff conducted on-site assessment of the records of an additional 10% of the LEA’s students receiving special education to validate the data submitted by the LEAs through self-assessment. Postsecondary plans were evaluated using the postsecondary transition plan checklist developed by the National Technical Assistance Center for Transition (NTACT). Findings of noncompliance were made in all instances and were identified both through self-assessment and on-site assessment.

|  | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16? | YES |
| If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age? | NO |
| If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator |  |

**If no, please explain**

In Maine, public agencies must meet these requirements for students in grade 9 and above, even if the students are younger than 16. However, for the baseline and yearly reporting on this indicator, only students ages 16 and above are included.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

Prior to considering any finding from FFY2017 corrected, Maine DOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b), (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. To verify that each LEA was correctly implementing the requirements, Maine DOE reviewed and verified subsequent data submitted by the LEAs through corrective action reports. This data demonstrated systemic correction of noncompliance. The time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance was within one year of the identification of the noncompliance. In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, Maine DOE also complied with the requirements to: account for all instances of noncompliance identified through monitoring procedures; identify the level, location, and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any LEA with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit corrected secondary transition plans developed after the finding of non-compliance.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

LEAs with noncompliant plans reviewed during monitoring received a finding for post-secondary transition plans. Because transition plan information can be corrected, the LEAs were required to convene IEP meetings to revise the plans to meet the requirements in those cases where transition plans were found to be noncompliant. The amended plans with prior written notice were submitted to Maine DOE for review. When all instances of noncompliance were reviewed and found compliant, the LEA's finding was closed.

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - Required Actions

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Results indicator:** Post-school outcomes: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

1. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
2. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
3. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school****is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

**I. *Definitions***

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

**II. *Data Reporting***

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

**III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators***

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| A | 2016 | Target >= | 25.00% | 25.00% | 25.00% | 25.00% | 27.00% |
| A | 18.81% | Data | 21.34% | 22.98% | 26.30% | 18.81% | 17.27% |
| B | 2016 | Target >= | 76.60% | 76.60% | 76.60% | 77.00% | 79.00% |
| B | 65.68% | Data | 37.49% | 62.12% | 68.87% | 65.68% | 71.21% |
| C | 2016 | Target >= | 82.30% | 82.30% | 82.30% | 83.00% | 84.00% |
| C | 77.56% | Data | 52.90% | 89.38% | 96.16% | 77.56% | 80.91% |

**FFY 2018 Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 30.00% | 30.00% |
| Target B >= | 80.00% | 80.00% |
| Target C >= | 85.00% | 85.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. Membership is specified in the federal regulations and a majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three to 20. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people: two parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26); an individual with a disability; a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative from the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. A majority of the members of the panel must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). Among the members is an individual who represents the SAP on the State Systemic Improvement Plan stakeholder group. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders. The director of the Maine DOE Office of Special Services met with the SAP during their quarterly meetings throughout FFY2018. Members were informed of department priorities and current issues and advice was sought from the membership for the Maine DOE to consider in legislation, rule-making, procedures and reporting. Topics included revisions to the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations, the State Systemic Improvement Plan, Significant Disproportionality Policy, and SPP/APR target-setting for FFY2019.Target-setting activities for the new SSIP consisted of series of meetings of the SAP membership in 2013 and 2014 during which members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. These meetings included input from the public. Past performance for each indicator in the first year with comparable consistent measurement with the baseline was identified. Possible targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years. Maine DOE staff members, including the director, data manager and SPP/APR coordinator, were available to answer any statistical or practical questions related to the indicators, past performance, or the analysis leading to suggestions of targets. SAP members discussed priorities and arrived at recommendations for targets for all results indicators (except B-17) for the life of the SPP. Additionally, in December, 2019, SAP members met to review all results indicator historical data and targets and recommended an extension of all results indicator targets for FFY2019.

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 277 |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 54 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 140 |
| 3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed) | 22 |
| 4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed). | 7 |

|  | **Number of respondent youth** | **Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 54 | 277 | 17.27% | 30.00% | 19.49% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 194 | 277 | 71.21% | 80.00% | 70.04% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4) | 223 | 277 | 80.91% | 85.00% | 80.51% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | XXX |
| **B** | Based on the survey results, slight slippage was observed for the competitive employment portion of category B. The reason for slippage in this category unclear, but Maine DOE has continued with several initiatives designed to improve transition services and promote continued education, employment, and success of individuals with disabilities in the workplace.Maine has engaged with the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition to provide programming entitled Translating Evidence to Support Transitions (TEST). The program delivers several curricula to support student-led post-secondary transition planning, career and technical education, and community partnerships. The Department has sponsored this work to ensure that IEPs include quality employment-focused goals, including increasing readiness for higher education, employment, and self-supportive choices. Maine DOE also has partnered with the Maine Medical Center and provided funding to develop transition planning training materials for school personnel, participate in family outreach events, and disseminate resources for families about the transition process. Additionally, Maine DOE has been collaborating with the Vocational Rehabilitation division of the Maine Department of Labor to provide resources that support students’ understanding of employment opportunities and training as part of transition planning. |
| **C** | XXX |

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

|  | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |
| If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? | NO |
| If yes, provide sampling plan. | XXX |

**Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.**

|  | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |
| If yes, attach a copy of the survey | XXX |

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

At least two phone calls were attempted for all 1,278 of the former students. The total count of survey respondents was 277, yielding a response rate of 21.67%. The respondent representativeness of the population of exiters (youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school) was assessed for Gender, Disability, Race/Ethnicity, Exit Reason, and Age, and all were found to be within 5% of the population percentages. The analysis indicates that the response group was representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

|  | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school? | YES |

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets. In its description of its FFY 2018 data, the State did not address whether the response group was representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

## 14 - Required Actions

# Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results Indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 15 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/11/2019 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 5 |
| SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/11/2019 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 2 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Provide an explanation below.**

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. Membership is specified in the federal regulations and a majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three to 20. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people: two parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26); an individual with a disability; a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative from the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. A majority of the members of the panel must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). Among the members is an individual who represents the SAP on the State Systemic Improvement Plan stakeholder group. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders. The director of the Maine DOE Office of Special Services met with the SAP during their quarterly meetings throughout FFY2018. Members were informed of department priorities and current issues and advice was sought from the membership for the Maine DOE to consider in legislation, rule-making, procedures and reporting. Topics included revisions to the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations, the State Systemic Improvement Plan, Significant Disproportionality Policy, and SPP/APR target-setting for FFY2019.Target-setting activities for the new SSIP consisted of series of meetings of the SAP membership in 2013 and 2014 during which members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. These meetings included input from the public. Past performance for each indicator in the first year with comparable consistent measurement with the baseline was identified. Possible targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years. Maine DOE staff members, including the director, data manager and SPP/APR coordinator, were available to answer any statistical or practical questions related to the indicators, past performance, or the analysis leading to suggestions of targets. SAP members discussed priorities and arrived at recommendations for targets for all results indicators (except B-17) for the life of the SPP. Additionally, in December, 2019, SAP members met to review all results indicator historical data and targets and recommended an extension of all results indicator targets for FFY2019.

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | 2005 | 57.00% |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target >= | 58.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% |
| Data | 0.00% | 25.00% |  | 0.00% | 14.29% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 58.00% | 58.00% |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2 | 5 | 14.29% | 58.00% | 40.00% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | 2018 (low) | 2018 (high) | 2019 (low) | 2019 (high) |
| Target | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target (low)** | **FFY 2018 Target (high)** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10.

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 15 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target. The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2018. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

## 15 - Required Actions

# Indicator 16: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/11/2019 | 2.1 Mediations held | 52 |
| SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/11/2019 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 20 |
| SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/11/2019 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 15 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Provide an explanation below**

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. Membership is specified in the federal regulations and a majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three to 20. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people: two parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26); an individual with a disability; a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative from the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. A majority of the members of the panel must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). Among the members is an individual who represents the SAP on the State Systemic Improvement Plan stakeholder group. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders. The director of the Maine DOE Office of Special Services met with the SAP during their quarterly meetings throughout FFY2018. Members were informed of department priorities and current issues and advice was sought from the membership for the Maine DOE to consider in legislation, rule-making, procedures and reporting. Topics included revisions to the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations, the State Systemic Improvement Plan, Significant Disproportionality Policy, and SPP/APR target-setting for FFY2019.Target-setting activities for the new SSIP consisted of series of meetings of the SAP membership in 2013 and 2014 during which members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. These meetings included input from the public. Past performance for each indicator in the first year with comparable consistent measurement with the baseline was identified. Possible targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years. Maine DOE staff members, including the director, data manager and SPP/APR coordinator, were available to answer any statistical or practical questions related to the indicators, past performance, or the analysis leading to suggestions of targets. SAP members discussed priorities and arrived at recommendations for targets for all results indicators (except B-17) for the life of the SPP. Additionally, in December, 2019, SAP members met to review all results indicator historical data and targets and recommended an extension of all results indicator targets for FFY2019.

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | 2005 | 83.30% |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target >= | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% |
| Data | 75.86% | 62.00% | 71.79% | 60.47% | 69.09% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 85.00% | 85.00% |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 20 | 15 | 52 | 69.09% | 85.00% | 67.31% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | 2018 (low) | 2018 (high) | 2019 (low) | 2019 (high) |
| Target | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target (low)** | | **FFY 2018 Target (high)** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | | XXX | XXX | XXX |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Mediation for due process procedures is a voluntary process, and although parties agree to mediation, they frequently come to a private settlement and withdraw their request for mediation and requests for hearings or complaint investigations. The percent of mediation agreements in FFY2018, 67.31%, did not meet the FFY2018 target of 85.00%. Additionally, the FFY2018 percent was slightly lower than the FFY2017 value of 69.09%. The reason for slippage is unclear. The due process office of Maine DOE has requested to be notified by the parties when a private settlement agreement has been reached. It is voluntary for the parties to provide this information. The due process office has information on some settlement agreements but is not made aware of all settlements. The private settlement agreements are not included in the total number of mediation agreements, nor is any form of informal resolution through the due process office.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 16 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target. The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2018. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## 16 - Required Actions

# Certification

**Instructions**

**Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.**

**Certify**

**I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.**

**Select the certifier’s role:**

Chief State School Officer

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

**Name:**

Erin Frazier

**Title:**

State Director of Special Services Birth to 20

**Email:**

erin.frazier@maine.gov

**Phone:**

207-624-6737

**Submitted on:**

04/29/20 4:49:32 PM