

## Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### General Supervision System:

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

Child Development Services (CDS), the governmental entity, is responsible for the implementation of Part C and Part B 619. As described in state statute: The MDOE 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)

Child Development Services implements the General Supervision System for Part C and Part B 619 in Maine. The system was designed in conjunction with the Maine Department of Education System to provide a B-20 system. Monitoring, findings, corrections and implementation of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and Maine Unified Special Education Regulation (MUSER) are the primary responsibilities for the Deputy Director and Quality Assurance Director of the CDS State Intermediate Educational Unit (IEU). All Sites are monitored, provided letter of findings, required to submit corrective action plans and are provided determinations annually. The Commissioner of Education provides certification of the information by submitting the letters of findings. Also, determinations are provided to all sites. CDS State IEU has adopted the Part B due process procedures and utilizes the Department of Education Due process office to fulfill the requirements set forth by IDEA.

### 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 early intervention service (EIS) programs.

In the spring of 2014, CDS advertised and interviewed for an Early Intervention Technical Advisor (EITA). On July 1, 2014 this position was filled. The primary responsibility of the EITA is to provide assistance to any early intervention provider/ program in Maine as needed or as determined. This person attended the Routines Based Intervention Certification Training provided by Dr. Robin McWilliam to become certified and able to provide and train in RBI.

Maine utilized technical assistance, professional development and dissemination resources throughout the State to provide scientifically based materials and instruction to educators, parents and interested parties. CDS contracted with an individual (Part C consultant) to provide Technical Assistance (TA), encompassing all Part C indicators, to Part C professionals throughout the year. She represented CDS at various state and national group meetings, managed the Part C process document, assisted in the implementation of the standardized Part C forms, provided training on the Part C process and forms to regional sites, attended CDS Regional State Leadership Team (RSLT) meetings, developed information for improving CDS Childfind efforts, and led the Part C Professional Development Implementation Team (PC-PDIT).

In addition, CDS requested assistance in the areas of natural environments for birth through two, eligibility timelines, unmet needs, child outcomes, C to B transition, General Supervision System, APR assistance, and data analysis from the Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC), the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTACenter) previously known as National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC), OSEP, Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center, the Infant and Toddler Coordinators Association (ITCA), and The Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy). CDS State IEU personnel participated in OSEP, NECTAC, and NERRC teleconferences and conferences as frequently as possible.

### Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

Early Intervention (EI) is the focus of one of the goals within Maine's State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) Goal 4 is "To increase the percentages of children, age's birth-two, receiving timely evidence-based early intervention services in their natural environments by qualified personnel." The objectives are (4.1) Increase the numbers of IDEA Part C teams and personnel trained in implementing evidence-based Early Intervention model and (4.2) Increase the compliance of SAUs in meeting the required steps/timelines in developing the IFSP.

The PC-PDIT was reconfigured in July 2013 to include representation from each of the nine CDS regional sites in Maine. The

PC-PDIT is responsible to develop and implement a sustainable model of professional development for the EI system. With consultation from Dr. Robin McWilliam, the PC-PDIT and State Leadership Team (SLT) have created a 5-component model for EI in the natural environment which provides the foundation and evidence-based practices used for training content and continued professional development for staff. The five components consist of understanding the family ecology, functional family-centered needs assessment, transdisciplinary services, support based home visits, and collaborative consultation to child care

The PC-PDIT uses research based strategies to foster fidelity of practice to increase job satisfaction, to increase willingness of staff to try new approaches, to improve transfer of training and sustainability of new practices, to enhance efficacy and fidelity, and to enrich collaboration through development of communities of practice through ongoing mentoring and coaching practices to ensure compliance and improved results for infants, toddlers and their families.

Other initiatives members of the SLT have key roles in are:

The State Interdepartmental Early Learning and Development Team (SAIEL) serves as an administrative governance structure between the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Human Services to ensure interagency coordination, streamline decision-making, allocate resources effectively, incorporate findings from the various demonstration projects statewide, and create long term sustainability for its early learning and development reform. The Early Intervention and 619 State Coordinator is a key member of this team.

The Developmental Systems Integration (DSI) project (a subgroup of Maine Quality Counts), overall goal is to improve the rate of general developmental screening. The goal of the initiative is to improve developmental screenings across the early childhood system by generating acceptance of a set of standardized developmental screening tools used by child health and early care and education providers. Also, to implement: protocols for training requirements and administration of developmental screening tools that promote reliable and valid results, mechanisms for sharing and communicating results efficiently and securely among child health and early care and education providers, and cross-departmental policies in support of the coordinated system, including Health Home (HH) and Patient Centered Medical Home (PCMH) initiatives.

#### **Stakeholder Involvement:**

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

The CDS State IEU utilizes the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State Performance Plan (SPP) and annual Performance Report (APR) including revisions and setting of targets. The SICC meets 6-10 times per year with a number of meetings scheduled to solely focus on data and reporting.

CDS is also involved in a number of initiatives in Maine where information is gathered from and shared in relation to Early Intervention Services and the success and challenges the State faces for infants and toddlers. Like the SICC these initiatives have cross sector representation.

#### **Reporting to the Public:**

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 performance of each EIS Program or Provider 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 2012 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 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

Reports to the public on the performance of the regional sites (EIS programs) are within the APR. Information is reported by regional site level as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A). All information, including the SPP, is available on the CDS website at <http://www.maine.gov/doe/cds/> under Reporting.

## Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	91.00%	95.40%	94.50%	91.00%	92.90%	99.00%	97.00%	99.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	833	1,921

#### Explanation of Alternate Data

The number of children with IFSP's for the reporting year (July 2013 through June 2014) is 1921 versus the child count number of 833. The full year data has historically been used to calculate timeliness of services.

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
1,913	1921	99.00%	100%	99.58%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner)	0
---	---

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Selection from the full reporting period of July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

The number of children with IFSP's for the reporting year (July 2013 through June 2014) is 1921 versus the child count number of 833. The full year data has historically been used to calculate timeliness of services.

Reasons for Delay	Count
CDS (no delay reason was given and/or delay was caused by regional site/ staff)	4
No available openings*	3
No provider available**	1
Provider interruption	0
Documented exceptional family circumstance	0
Total	<b>8</b>
*No available openings – Provider is available but has no time available. **No provider available – No provider is available.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites	
	Target
CDS Aroostook	100%
CDS Reach	98.9%
CDS First Step	98.0%
CDS Two Rivers	100%
CDS Midcoast	100%
CDS Opportunities	100%
CDS Project PEDS	100%
CDS Downeast	100%
CDS York	100%
<b>State Total</b>	<b>99.58%</b>

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

None required.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	7	0	0

**FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2012 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the State data system (Case-e); and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance and has provided services although late for any child whose services were not delivered timely, unless the child is 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 LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance*

Specifically, to verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from Case-e, performed on-site file reviews, and verified subsequent data submitted through regional site self-assessments and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The subsequent time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance with the specific regulatory requirements varied based on the level of noncompliance identified in the program.

Through Case-e, CDS was also able to verify that each child received services, 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 CAP. 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.

## Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		91.00%	92.00%	93.00%	94.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Data	89.00%	85.00%	87.00%	90.00%	85.00%	91.00%	88.00%	98.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	96.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On January 15, 2015 the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for C2 from FFY2013 through FFY2018. The SICC is made up of members appointed by the governor of the state, for the purpose of advising and assisting the Lead Agency in the implementation of the Part C program, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SICC by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SICC members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The ICC's recommendations for targets were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	828	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	833	

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data

FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

intervention services in the home or community-based settings				
828	833	98.00%	95.00%	99.40%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites	
	Target 95%
CDS Aroostook	97.78%
CDS Reach	99.50%
CDS First Step	99.15%
CDS Two Rivers	100%
CDS Midcoast	100%
CDS Opportunities	98.65%
CDS Project PEDS	100%
CDS Downeast	98.08%
CDS York	100%
<b>State Total</b>	<b>99.40%</b>

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None required.

## Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

*Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments*

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A1	2008	Target ≥					52.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%
		Data				51.50%	43.50%	42.00%	40.00%	24.00%
A2	2008	Target ≥					40.00%	41.00%	41.00%	41.00%
		Data				39.70%	42.10%	52.00%	50.00%	37.00%
B1	2008	Target ≥					59.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%
		Data				59.10%	53.50%	52.00%	39.00%	37.00%
B2	2008	Target ≥					26.00%	27.00%	27.00%	27.00%
		Data				25.60%	26.80%	33.00%	26.00%	23.00%
C1	2008	Target ≥					52.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%
		Data				51.50%	54.70%	56.00%	51.00%	48.00%
C2	2008	Target ≥					37.00%	38.00%	38.00%	38.00%
		Data				37.20%	38.60%	48.00%	43.00%	34.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	54.00%
Target A2 ≥	41.00%	41.00%	41.00%	41.00%	41.00%	42.00%
Target B1 ≥	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	61.00%
Target B2 ≥	27.00%	27.00%	27.00%	27.00%	27.00%	28.00%
Target C1 ≥	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	54.00%
Target C2 ≥	38.00%	38.00%	38.00%	38.00%	38.00%	39.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On January 15, 2015 the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for C3 from FFY2013 through FFY2018. The SICC is made up of members appointed by the governor of the state, for the purpose of advising and assisting the Lead Agency in the implementation of the Part C program, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SICC by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SICC members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The ICC's recommendations for targets were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	339
--	-----

Does the State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental

delays (or “at-risk infants and toddlers”) under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? No

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

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	6
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	114
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	33
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	64
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	122

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
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 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$ .	97	217	24.00%	53.00%	44.70%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$ .	186	339	37.00%	41.00%	54.87%

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

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	1
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	135
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	88
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	72
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	40

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
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 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$ .	160	296	37.00%	60.00%	54.05%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$ .	112	336	23.00%	27.00%	33.33%

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

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	3
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	88
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	50
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	93

	Number of Children
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	104

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
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 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	143	234	48.00%	53.00%	61.11%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	197	338	34.00%	38.00%	58.28%

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites						
	Outcome A		Outcome B		Outcome C	
	SS 1	SS 2	SS 1	SS 2	SS 1	SS 2
<b>Target</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>38%</b>
CDS Aroostook	85.7%	68.8%	61.5%	25%	72.7%	50%
CDS Reach	25%	62.7%	41%	30.7%	51.7%	58.8%
CDS First Step	38%	42.2%	53.2%	25.4%	55.8%	57.8%
CDS Two Rivers	38.5%	47.1%	62.5%	35.3%	71.4%	47.1%
CDS Midcoast	46.7%	52.3%	58.8%	50%	46.7%	56.8%
CDS Opportunities	56.3%	58.1%	66.7%	32.6%	68.4%	51.2%
CDS Project PEDS	58.3%	65%	52.9%	40%	66.7%	70%
CDS Downeast	54.5%	50%	44.4%	36.4%	70%	63.6%
CDS York	61.1%	42.9%	70%	33.3%	88.9%	76.2%
<b>State Total</b>	<b>44.70%</b>	<b>54.87%</b>	<b>54.05%</b>	<b>33.33%</b>	<b>61.11%</b>	<b>58.28%</b>

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

Progress data and actual target data for FFY2013 is reported in the FFY 2013 APR as required.

## Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

### Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2006	Target ≥				89.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%
		Data		76.00%	85.00%	88.00%	76.00%	90.00%	88.00%	96.57%
B	2006	Target ≥				89.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%
		Data		85.00%	79.00%	92.00%	82.00%	92.00%	88.00%	96.59%
C	2006	Target ≥				89.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%
		Data		88.00%	85.00%	92.00%	82.00%	92.00%	94.00%	97.56%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	92.00%
Target B ≥	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	92.00%
Target C ≥	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	92.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On January 15, 2015 the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for C4 from FFY2013 through FFY2018. The SICC is made up of members appointed by the governor of the state, for the purpose of advising and assisting the Lead Agency in the implementation of the Part C program, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SICC by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SICC members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The ICC's recommendations for targets were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	223
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	215
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	223
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	214
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	223

**FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	212
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	223

	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	96.57%	91.00%	96.41%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	96.59%	91.00%	95.96%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	97.56%	91.00%	95.07%

**Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.**

Data were collected in the spring of 2014. All families of children receiving services through the nine regional sites (Part C and 619) received a parent survey via a telephone call. 937 Part C families were contacted to complete the survey and 223 responded, yielding a response rate of 23.8%. This response rate is relatively similar to FFY 2012 response rate of 24%. Analyses of representativeness by gender and race/ethnicity were conducted, and respondent data was found to be representative of the CDS population.

**Was sampling used?** No

**Was a collection tool used?** No

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

Due to not all families responding to each question in the survey, the following table demonstrates the states calculated percent based on a different denominator for A, B and C.

	FFY 2013 State Calculated	
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	$[(215) \div (219)] * 100$	98.17%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	$[(223) \div (214)] * 100$	95.96%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	$[(221) \div (212)] * 100$	95.93%

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites			
	A%	B%	C%
<b>Target</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>91%</b>
CDS Aroostook	100%	100%	93.33%
CDS Reach	100%	98.21%	96.36%
CDS First Step	93.75%	87.50%	100%
CDS Two Rivers	95.24%	95.45%	90.91%
CDS Midcoast	100%	100%	100%
CDS Opportunities	96.43%	92.86%	96.43%
CDS Project PEDS	96%	88.46%	92.31%

**FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

CDS Downeast	100%	100%	100%
CDS York	100%	100%	97.22%
<b>State Total</b>	<b>98.17%</b>	<b>95.96%</b>	<b>95.93%</b>

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings****

None required.

### Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		0.80%	0.85%	0.75%	0.77%	0.82%	0.82%	0.82%
Data	0.65%	0.64%	0.71%	0.52%	0.64%	0.52%	0.63%	0.70%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

#### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	0.82%	0.82%	0.82%	0.82%	0.82%	0.83%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On January 15, 2015 the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for C5 from FFY2013 through FFY2018. The SICC is made up of members appointed by the governor of the state, for the purpose of advising and assisting the Lead Agency in the implementation of the Part C program, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SICC by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SICC members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The ICC's recommendations for targets were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	79	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	12/16/2014	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	12,617	

#### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
79	12,617	0.70%	0.82%	0.63%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites	
	Target
CDS Aroostook	0.30%
CDS Reach	1.17%
CDS First Step	0.49%
CDS Two Rivers	0.22%
CDS Midcoast	0.71%
CDS Opportunities	0.64%
CDS Project PEDS	0.36%
CDS Downeast	1.00%
CDS York	0.53%
<b>State Total</b>	<b>0.63%</b>

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None required.

**Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		2.91%	2.43%	2.55%	2.67%	2.81%	2.81%	2.81%
Data	2.89%	2.51%	2.38%	2.29%	2.29%	2.37%	2.49%	2.42%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	2.81%	2.81%	2.81%	2.81%	2.81%	2.90%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

On January 15, 2015 the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for C6 from FFY2013 through FFY2018. The SICC is made up of members appointed by the governor of the state, for the purpose of advising and assisting the Lead Agency in the implementation of the Part C program, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SICC by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SICC members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The ICC's recommendations for targets were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	833	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	12/16/2014	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	38,383	

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
833	38,383	2.42%	2.81%	2.17%

**Explanation of Slippage**

## FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Although not meeting the target and demonstrating a decrease since FFY 2012, the CDS system has done a great deal of work to ensure the community and public are aware of CDS and the procedure for making referrals to CDS. Many regional sites have met with local providers and medical groups to ensure they understand the importance of making referrals to the program. This area is of importance to the state team as well as many of its stakeholders. In addition to increasing knowledge, and ease for referrals sources, training will occur with regional sites on eligibility requirements and childfind responsibilities. Even though the overall population of infants and toddlers in Maine continues to decrease the CDS State IEU feels the percentage of infants and toddlers with IFSP could either meet or come closer to target.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites	
Target	2.81%
CDS Aroostook	2.29%
CDS Reach	2.66%
CDS First Step	2.80%
CDS Two Rivers	0.99%
CDS Midcoast	2.49%
CDS Opportunities	1.98%
CDS Project PEDS	1.85%
CDS Downeast	2.92%
CDS York	2.10%
<b>State Total</b>	<b>2.17%</b>

### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None required.

## Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	94.40%	91.00%	91.10%	70.00%	64.60%	85.00%	88.00%	89.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
510	618	89.00%	100%	82.52%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline)	
--	--

### Explanation of Slippage

Slippage, for the 2013-2014 reporting period, is at least in part, due to the implementation of a new family assessment tool (Routines-Based Interview) and its integration into the Child Development Services intake process. CDS has worked extensively with Robin McWilliam throughout the reporting year to bring this to Maine. The Routines-Based Interview (RBI) is an intensive two hour assessment which, at times, necessitated an additional appointment. Also, due to training and fidelity checks, additional personnel were required to be present at intake appointments which resulted in significant scheduling challenges for the family, staff and trainers. In addition to the implementation of the RBI, staff turnover and vacancies also had an adverse impact on timelines.

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Selection from the full reporting period of July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

The data accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period since a full reporting year is used (July 2013 through June 2014). The full year data has historically been used to calculate timelines.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites	
Target	100%
CDS Aroostook	90.48%
CDS Reach	75.34%
CDS First Step	89.83%
CDS Two Rivers	100%
CDS Midcoast	85.71%
CDS Opportunities	92.68%
CDS Project PEDS	100%
CDS Downeast	96.30%
CDS York	63.83%
<b>State Total</b>	<b>82.52%</b>

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

None required.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	9	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2012 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) (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) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is 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 LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance

Specifically, to verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from Case-e, performed on-site file reviews, and verified subsequent data submitted through regional site self-assessments and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The subsequent time period for which

each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance with the specific regulatory requirements varied based on the level of noncompliance identified in the program.

Through Case-e, CDS was also able to verify that each child received an evaluation, assessment and initial IFSP, 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 CAP. 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.

## Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	69.00%	69.00%	83.50%	79.00%	86.60%	87.00%	94.00%	99.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.

- Yes
- No

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
525	526	99.00%	100%	99.81%

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

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Selection from the full reporting period of July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Data were collected from the State database (Case-e) for all children for the reporting period of July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014. The full year data has historically been used to calculate this indicator. Data were verified through comparison with reports submitted to regional sites. Findings of noncompliance were made based on these data, as appropriate.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Reason for Delay	Count
CDS (no delay reason was given and/or delay was caused by regional site/ staff)	1

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites	
Target	100%
CDS Aroostook	100%
CDS Reach	100%
CDS First Step	98.95%
CDS Two Rivers	100%
CDS Midcoast	100%
CDS Opportunities	100%
CDS Project PEDS	100%
CDS Downeast	100%
CDS York	100%
<b>State Total</b>	<b>99.81%</b>

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings**

None required.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

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 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2012 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) (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) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is 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 LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance*

Specifically, to verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed

subsequent updated data from Case-e, performed on-site file reviews, and verified subsequent data submitted through regional site self-assessments and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The subsequent time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance with the specific regulatory requirements varied based on the level of noncompliance identified in the program.

Through Case-e, CDS was also able to verify that each child within CDS had an IFSP with transition steps and services if they were still in the jurisdiction of the early intervention 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 CAPs. CDS State IEU and the regional site created the CAP. 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.

## Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
526	526	100%	100%	100%

### Describe the method used to collect these data

Data were collected from the State database (Case-e) for all children for the reporting period of July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014. The full year data has historically been used to calculate this indicator. Data were verified through comparison with reports submitted to regional sites. Findings of noncompliance were made based on these data, as appropriate.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites	
Target	100%
CDS Aroostook	100%
CDS Reach	100%
CDS First Step	100%
CDS Two Rivers	100%
CDS Midcoast	100%
CDS Opportunities	100%
CDS Project PEDS	100%
CDS Downeast	100%
CDS York	100%
<b>State Total</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings**

None required.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

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

## Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	87.00%	87.00%	60.00%	56.00%	94.80%	93.00%	77.00%	83.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
439	526	83.00%	100%	83.46%

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Selection from the full reporting period of July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014

**Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.**

Data were collected from the State database (Case-e) for all children for the reporting period of July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014. The full year data has historically been used to calculate this indicator. Data were verified through comparison with reports submitted to regional sites. Findings of noncompliance were made based on these data, as appropriate.

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

Reason for Delay	Count
CDS (no delay reason was given and/or delay was caused by regional site/ staff)	87

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites	
Target	100%
CDS Aroostook	80.95%
CDS Reach	91.24%
CDS First Step	70.53%
CDS Two Rivers	100.00%
CDS Midcoast	86.67%
CDS Opportunities	79.49%
CDS Project PEDS	93.18%
CDS Downeast	86.96%
CDS York	72.29%
<b>State Total</b>	<b>83.46%</b>

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings**

None required.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	9	0	0

**FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2012 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)) (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) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is 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 LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance*

Specifically, to verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from Case-e, performed on-site file reviews, and verified subsequent data submitted through regional site self-assessments and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The subsequent time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance with the specific regulatory requirements varied based on the level of noncompliance identified in the program.

Through Case-e, CDS was also able to verify that each child in CDS had a transition conference, 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 CAP. 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.

## Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

### Historical Data

Baseline Data:

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		0%	0%	0%	5.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%
Data			0%					

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	7.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On January 15, 2015 the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for C9 from FFY2013 through FFY2018. The SICC is made up of members appointed by the governor of the state, for the purpose of advising and assisting the Lead Agency in the implementation of the Part C program, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SICC by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SICC members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The ICC's recommendations for targets were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/12/2013	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/12/2013	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0	

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

3.1 Number of resolution sessions	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	0		6.00%	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

There was 1 due process compliant filed and it was withdrawn/ or dismissed as of the end of the reporting period.

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None required.

## Indicator 10: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		77.00%	78.00%	80.00%	82.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Data		100%		100%			100%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	86.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On January 15, 2015 the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for C10 from FFY2013 through FFY2018. The SICC is made up of members appointed by the governor of the state, for the purpose of advising and assisting the Lead Agency in the implementation of the Part C program, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SICC by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SICC members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The ICC's recommendations for targets were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0	1
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0	0
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1 Mediations held	0	1

### Explanation of Alternate Data

An error was made in Maine's submission of data through EMAPs. The correct data has been entered here in the Overwrite Data section.

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

**FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
1	0	1	100%	85.00%	100%

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None required.

## Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

### Baseline Data

FFY	2013
Data	

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target					

### Description of Measure

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

### Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., EIS program and/or EIS provider, geographic region, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, etc.) As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

### Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and other early learning initiatives, such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program and describe the extent that these new initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

### State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families

## FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child- or family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increase the rate of growth in infants and toddlers demonstrating positive social-emotional skills) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increase the percentage reported under child outcome B under Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR (knowledge and skills) and increase the percentage trend reported for families under Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).

*Statement*

*Description*

### Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support EIS program and/or EIS provider implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build EIS program and/or EIS provider capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

### Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in EIS programs and/or EIS providers, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Submitted Theory of Action: [Theory of Action Graphic](#)

Illustration



Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

## Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

This indicator is not applicable.