ME
Part B

FFY2013
State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

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 B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

see attachment

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 DOE and Child Development Services provide a range of technical assistance to improve performance from minimal assistance to substantial interventions. Technical assistance is implemented at varying levels and through multiple means such as websites, local, regional and/or statewide meetings and conferences, virtual or direct training from state personnel or 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 technical assistance that is cross-collaborative.

State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG). The SPDG supports delivery of technical assistance by the Office of Special Services (OSS). The evidence-based practices used throughout the SPDG professional development complements LEA's evidence-based initiatives in the multi-tiered system of support (e.g., positive behavioral interventions and supports, response to intervention), hence creating a universally designed learning environment for all children in the general education setting. Evidence-based practice professional development (EBP PD) facilitates the development of leader teams within a region, focused on an area of need for that region. Training is provided regionally to ensure a broader catchment area, in order to establish regional leader teams. Teams are made up of district-based groups that have defined the focus area as an area of need for their district. Through self-assessment and development of improvement plans, district teams improve their practice at their district and bring their expertise to their region. Then, as leader teams, they receive technical assistance via a coach trained in the area of development to continue their growth as resources to the districts in their region.

SPDG professional development resources and activities are available on-line. Teams and their regions have access to these dynamic resources. They include video of live trainings, document and guidance resources, and collaboration tools.

Coaching is a key piece to the implementation of technical assistance throughout Maine DOE initiatives. Maine has been granted a two-year waiver from school improvement provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This flexibility from the United State Department of Education has allowed Maine to implement its own statewide ambitious yet achievable plan to improve educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps and increase the quality of instruction. Coaching is a key piece to the implementation of technical assistance throughout Maine DOE initiatives. Maine has been granted a two-year waiver from school improvement provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This flexibility from the United State Department of Education has allowed Maine to implement its own statewide ambitious yet achievable plan to improve educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps and increase the quality of instruction.

At the heart of the State's plan is a system of differentiated recognition, accountability and support for Maine's 380 Title I-served schools. Schools have been placed in one of five categories: priority, focus, monitor, progressing and meeting. These tiers allow the State to most intensively target its support to the schools that past performance shows need it the most, though improvement resources will be available to all public schools. The focus and priority schools have been assigned coaches and those coaches have worked with the Maine DOE Office of Special Services to ensure that their schools are accessing SPDG and other professional development activities, and using data to set goals to close the gap for students with disabilities.

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.

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 are provided in August and typically follow an alternating year schedule. In 2014 a high turnover rate, including a high number of new directors, required a more intense schedule of training, including a follow up session. 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.

see attachment

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. They bring to the table the responsibility of representation of their own field and community level stakeholders.

The director of the Maine DOE Office of Special Services met with the SAP during their quarterly meetings throughout the FFY2013 year. Members were informed of department priorities and current issues and advice was sought from the membership for the Maine DOE to consider in legislation, rulemaking, procedures and reporting. Topics included revisions to the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations and the State Systemic Improvement Plan.

Target setting activities were a series of meetings of the SAP membership 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. Then possible targets were suggested given analyses of regression and exponential smoothing. 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 amongst themselves and arrived at recommendations for targets for all results indicators (except B-17) for the life of the SPP.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 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 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.

School year 2012-13 LEA determinations were reported to the public no later than 120 days following Maine's submission of its FFY2012 APR. These determinations are posted on the following webpage:

http://www.maine.gov/doe/specialed/support/spp/leadeterminations2012.html

The requirement for public reporting on LEA performance is a critical provision in ensuring accountability and focusing on improved results for children with disabilities. The Department developed reports on six accountability indicators: Graduation, Dropout, Suspension/Expulsion, Classroom Placement, Parent Involvement and Post High School outcomes, and four compliance indicators: Disproportionate Representation in Special Education, Disproportionate Representation in Disability Categories, Evaluation Timeliness, and Transition Goals in IEP. 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. Data profile designs based on the school year 2013-14 performance and compliance data were developed for each Local Educational Agency (LEA) in the State. 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 the 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 SPP including revisions submitted with the FFY2012 APR in 2012 is located on the following webpage:

http://www.maine.gov/doe/specialed/support/spp/index.html

Data profiles for Part B 619 students are posted on the SPP website:

http://www.maine.gov/doe/specialed/support/spp/publicreporting/index.html

School year 2013-14 LEA determinations are currently posted on the SPP website:

http://www.maine.gov/doe/specialed/support/spp/index.html

OSEP Response

The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 APRs. In its June 23, 2014 Determination Letter to the State, OSEP advised the State of available technical assistance, and required the State to report, with the FFY 2013 SPP/APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance in response to this requirement and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

While the State has publicly reported on the FFY 2012 (July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013) performance of each of the other local educational agencies (LEAs) 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, those reports do not contain the required FFY 2012 performance information for the Child Development Services (CDS) LEA. Beginning with FFY 2013, the State has begun to do the required public reporting for CDS, and provided OSEP a Web site link where the State has publicly reported on the FFY 2013 performance of each LEA, which includes CDS. The State is required to also provide that link in its FFY 2014 APR.

Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		78.00%	80.00%	82.00%	84.00%	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%
Data	74.30%	77.00%	76.00%	64.70%	64.70%	65.10%	66.02%	70.12%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-1 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP 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 SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	1,844	1844
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	2,620	2,620
SY 2012-13 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/23/2014	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	70.38%	Calculate

Explanation of Alternate Data

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current	Number of youth with IEPs in the	FFY 2012	FFY 2013	FFY 2013

year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	Data	Target	Data
1,844	2,620	70.12%	90.00%	70.38%

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

Calculations and data for the 2012-13 graduates are the same as those used for reporting under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Starting in 2008-09, Maine moved to the new federally-required method for calculating the graduation rate known as the Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate, or ACGR, which shows the percentage of students who entered 9th grade and graduated within four years. The purpose of the federal requirement is to use the same method across states and to provide more consistency in reporting and comparisons across states. It is important to note this rate does not reflect the students who graduate from high school in five or six years. It also does not include students who earn a GED.

For the graduation rate for the class of 2013, Maine compared the number of students who entered 9th grade for the first time four years in the fall of 2009 and received a “regular high school diploma" upon their 2013 graduation. For this calculation the denominator contains the cohort of all first time ninth graders from four years earlier plus all transfers into this cohort minus all transfers out (e.g., death, moving to another state). The numerator contains only “regular” diploma recipients from the four year cohort.

Maine does not have different conditions for graduation for students with IEPs.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤		4.00%	3.50%	3.00%	3.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Data	8.60%	3.50%	3.70%	3.80%	5.50%	5.50%	5.04%	5.50%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	19.83%	19.83%	19.80%	19.80%	19.00%	19.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-2 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP 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 SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,205	null
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	27	null
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	11	null
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	309	null
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	6	null

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21)	Total number of all youth with	FFY 2012	FFY 2013	FFY 2013

who exited special education due to dropping out [d]	IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) [a + b + c + d + e]	Data*	Target*	Data
309	1,558	5.50%	19.83%	19.83%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The FFY2013 dropout rate represents a new baseline for Maine. Prior to the current reporting year, Maine used a calculation that was formerly used for reporting under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act: (number of youth with IEPs ages 14-20 reported as dropouts / number of youth with IEPs ages 14 through 20 in secondary enrollment) * 100. For ease of reporting, ease of state to national comparisons, and because the former calculation is no longer used in the ESEA consolidated State Performance Report, Maine has chosen to use the same calculation as that used in 618 IDEA reporting (number of youth with IEPs ages 14 through 20 who exited special education due to dropping out/number of youth with IEPs ages 14 thorugh 20 who left high school)*100.

Given this new baseline it is important to point out that the performance is the percentage of students with IEPs ages 14-20 who left high school the year in which the data was collected. The reasons for which students with IEPs may have left school include:

- graduating with a regular high school diploma,
- receiving a certificate,
- reaching maximum age,
- dropping out, and
- as a result of death.

These students make up the denominator in this calculation. FFY13 performance identifies 19.83% of these students as having dropped out of high school.

The Maine DOE Data Warehouse provides FFY12 data on the above categories. This information may further assist the reader in understanding the new baseline. The Data Warehouse can be found at:

http://dw.education.maine.gov/DirectoryManager/Web/maine_report/MaineLanding.aspx

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP accepts the State's change in baseline from FFY 2011 to FFY 2013 data.

Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. **Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.**
B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		97.50%	97.50%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%
Data	97.90%	93.23%	95.60%	94.74%	95.33%	55.88%	40.00%	27.22%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	40.00%	50.00%	60.00%	70.00%	80.00%	98.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-3A from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP 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 SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP?

(●) Yes ( ) No

Are you reporting AYP or AMO?

( ) AYP (●) AMO

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AMO	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
226	166	37	27.22%	40.00%	22.29%

Explanation of Slippage

The primary factor impacting slippage is the change in methodology for subgroup targets for Maine's approved ESEA waiver. In addition, the State failed to meet its target due to the significant yearly increases in academic targets that districts were required to meet to make their Annual Measurable Objectives. Objectives include proficiency targets as measured by outcomes on the NECAP, participation level in accountability testing, average daily attendance in grade 3-8, and meeting increasing targets in graduation

rates.

In August 2013 Maine received approval for an accountability waiver under ESEA. Subgroup targets were calculated for each school and subgroup individually. In order for schools to make Annual Measurable Objectives in 2013-14, they had to meet targets based on the methodology outlined in Maine's ESEA waiver application. The minimum n-size of sub groups was decreased from 20 to 10. Safe harbor provisions used in previous years have been removed. Additionally, in the ESEA waiver the high school graduation rate requirement was raised to 90%. As a result of these factors, several schools did not meet the attendance, graduation, or achievement requirements in FFY2012 for the first time. Schools have not yet had sufficient time to show improvement.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For more information on Maine's ESEA waiver please go to the Maine DOE website at: http://maine.gov/doe/accountability/.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP accepts the State's correction to the prepopulated baseline from FFY 2005 to FFY 2012, which is consistent with the State's FFY 2012 APR.

Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. **Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.**
B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A Grade 3-8	2013	Target ≥								
			Data	95.33%							
	B High School	2013	Target ≥								
			Data								
Math	A Grade 3-8	2013	Target ≥								
			Data	95.33%							
	B High School	2013	Target ≥								
			Data								

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3-8	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%
	B ≥ High School	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3-8	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%
	B ≥ High School	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-3B from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP 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 SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

Data Source: SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	2162	2387	2428	2444	2455	2495	n	n	n	n	2048
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	466	392	325	413	393	427					766
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1485	1744	1858	1794	1809	1772					893
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	155	219	211	192	208	235					195

Data Source: SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	2161	2386	2428	2444	2454	2495	n	n	n	n	2048
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	469	410	322	431	388	427					762
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1492	1727	1858	1780	1808	1771					899
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	150	217	209	187	208	234					194

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Grade 3-8	14,371	14,098		98.00%	98.10%
B High School	2,048	1,854		98.00%	90.53%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Grade 3-8	14,368	14,088		98.00%	98.05%
B High School	2,048	1,855		98.00%	90.58%

Public Reporting Information

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

http://dw.education.maine.gov/DirectoryManager/WEB/Maine_Report/SpecialEducationDT.aspx

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State met its rigorous target of 98% participation in reading and math for students with disabilities in grades 3-8, but not in high school grades. This is the first year the data is disaggregated and is baseline data for grades 3-8 and high school participation. As a result data cannot be compared to performance in previous years and a statement of slippage in participation for students in high school cannot be made.

The State has endeavored to address issues of attendance through on-going state-wide activities. Title IA works directly with school staff to review the participation and performance rates of all students, which includes students with IEPs. More detailed analyses of slippage as well as improvement strategies to address that slippage will be included in Maine's State Systemic Improvement Plan.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP accepts the State's change in baseline from FFY 2005 to FFY 2013 data.

Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. **Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.**
B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A Grade 3-8	2009	Target ≥				58.00%	66.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%
			Data				35.00%	31.00%	31.00%	34.00%	32.60%
	B HS	2009	Target ≥				64.00%	71.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%
			Data				15.00%	13.00%	17.00%	16.00%	13.80%
Math	A Grade 3-8	2009	Target ≥				50.00%	60.00%	78.00%	78.00%	78.00%
			Data				32.00%	29.00%	28.00%	29.00%	29.00%
	B HS	2009	Target ≥				43.00%	54.00%	66.00%	78.00%	66.00%
			Data				11.00%	13.00%	15.00%	29.00%	13.71%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3-8	35.00%	35.00%	45.00%	60.00%	75.00%	90.00%
	B ≥ HS	20.00%	20.00%	30.00%	50.00%	70.00%	90.00%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3-8	30.00%	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%	70.00%	90.00%
	B ≥ HS	15.00%	15.00%	25.00%	45.00%	70.00%	90.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-3C from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP 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 SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

Data Source: SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 12/18/2014

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	2106	2355	2394	2399	2410	2434	n	n	n	n	1854
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	265	213	159	168	167	151					119
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	320	354	433	419	398	402					92
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	90	141	167	171	150	162	n	n	n	n	85

Data Source: SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 12/18/2014

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	2111	2354	2389	2398	2404	2432	n	n	n	n	1855
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	235	199	129	143	111	85					87
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	337	418	425	303	248	208					94
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	106	143	144	136	146	150	n	n	n	n	110

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A	14,098	4,330	32.60%	35.00%	30.71%

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
Grade 3-8					
B HS	1,854	296	13.80%	20.00%	15.97%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

~~Maine began using a differentiated accountability system after the approval of the ESEA waiver request in August, 2013. Each category now has a comprehensive and structured way of measuring progress. In FFY2012 Annual measurable objectives (AMO) were changed from a common AMO for all subgroups to one that is individualized and based on new and individualized trajectories. Objectives include proficiency targets as measured by outcomes on the NECAP. The minimum n-size of subgroups was decreased from 20 to 10, and safe harbor has been removed, impacting a school's ability to show growth. For more information on Maine's ESEA waiver please go to the Maine DOE website at: http://maine.gov/doe/accountability/.~~

~~Maine has selected increased proficiency for students with disabilities as the general area of focus for the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). While high school students with disabilities consistently demonstrate poorer proficiency rates than the grade 3-8 group, the elementary and middle school group continues a downward trend whereas the high school group is moving in a positive slope. Data analysis and evidence based research conducted in the development of Maine's SSIP indicate root causes of continued decreases in proficiency in reading include the amount of time students are accessing the general education curriculum and receiving special education in the general education classroom.~~

UPDATE:

Potential factors that might explain slippage in proficiency measures in reading for students with disabilities in grades 3-8 include:

1) the amount of time students with disabilities are accessing the general education curriculum,

2) the amount of time students with disabilities are receiving special education in the general education classroom, and

3) alignment of instruction with the State standards.

These root causes of poor proficiency for students with disabilities are described in evidence-based research. Growth in math proficiency for students with disabilities is the area of focus for Maine's SSIP. Improvement strategies specific to math can generalize to reading, and are expected to impact growth in both areas for students with disabilities.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Grade 3-8	14,088	3,666	29.00%	30.00%	26.02%
B HS	1,855	291	13.71%	15.00%	15.69%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

~~Maine began using a differentiated accountability system after the approval of the ESEA waiver request in August, 2013. Each category now has a comprehensive and structured way of measuring progress. In FFY2012 Annual measurable objectives (AMO) were changed from a common AMO for all subgroups to one that is individualized and based on new and individualized trajectories. Objectives include proficiency targets as measured by outcomes on the NECAP. The minimum n-size of subgroups was decreased from 20 to 10, and safe harbor has been removed, impacting a school's ability to show growth. For more information on Maine's ESEA waiver please go to the Maine DOE website at: http://maine.gov/doe/accountability/.~~

~~Maine has selected increased proficiency for students with disabilities as the general area of focus for the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). While Maine currently implements activities addressing proficiency for all students with disabilities, data analysis conducted in the development of Maine's SSIP revealed proficiency for students with disabilities in math is~~

~~weaker than that in reading. Further, evidence based research conducted in the development of Maine's SSIP indicates root causes of continued decreases in proficiency in math include the amount of time students are accessing the general education curriculum and receiving special education in the general education classroom.~~

Update:

Potential factors that might explain slippage in proficiency measures in math for students with disabilities in grades 3-8 include

1) the amount of time students with disabilities are accessing the general education curriculum,

2) the amount of time students with disabilities are receiving special education in the general education classroom, and

3) alignment of instruction with the State standards.

These root causes of poor proficiency for students with disabilities are described in evidence-based research. Growth in math proficiency for students with disabilities is the area of focus for Maine's SSIP. Improvement strategies specific to math are expected to impact growth in math for students with disabilities.

Public Reporting Information

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

http://dw.education.maine.gov/DirectoryManager/WEB/Maine_Report/SpecialEducationDT.aspx

---

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Various national resource centers have been engaged in the development and implementation of improvement activities regarding the use of standards for students with disabilities. These agencies include New England Regional Resource Center (NERRC), National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE), IDEA Data Center (IDC) and The National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC). Maine partners with institutes of higher education (such as University of Maine at Orono (UMO)) to provide technical assistance to leader team coaches and, at times, to the leader teams implementing professional development with their regions.

The Maine State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) is an important method of TA used by the Office of Special Services (OSS). The federally funded SPDG is designed to assist districts in Maine in reforming and improving their personnel preparation and professional development systems that will result in improved long-term and effective educational results for children with disabilities. The SPDG is made up of five goals, one of which focuses specifically on improving proficiency outcomes for students with disabilities by supporting the development of standards aligned IEPs.

The process of developing professional skills for sharing knowledge and technical assistance facilitates the development of leader teams within a region, focused on an area of need for that region. Training is provided regionally to ensure a broader catchment area, in order to establish regional leader teams. Teams are made up of district-based groups that have defined the focus area as an area of need for their district. Through self-assessment and development of improvement plans, district teams improve their practice at their district and bring their expertise to their region. Then, as leader teams, they receive technical assistance via a coach trained in the area of development to continue their growth as resources to the districts in their region.
Coaching is a key piece to the implementation of technical assistance throughout Maine DOE initiatives. Maine has been granted a two-year waiver from school improvement provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This flexibility from the United State Department of Education has allowed Maine to implement its own statewide ambitious yet achievable plan to improve educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps and increase the quality of instruction. As a result, Maine will cut in half the percentage of non-proficient students at each school over the next six years.

The State will do that through the continued implementation of the Maine Learning Results, a set of high standards--recently updated to include the Common Core--that ensure students graduate college and career ready. The Maine Department of Education has also helped local school districts develop and deploy educator evaluation and support systems to be piloted in 2014-15 and fully implemented in 2015-16.

At the heart of the State's plan is a system of differentiated recognition, accountability and support for Maine's 380 Title I-served schools. Schools have been placed in one of five categories: priority, focus, monitor, progressing and meeting. Unlike the original NCLB measures, Maine's approved plan distinguishes schools not just by student proficiency but also progress. These tiers allow the State to most intensively target its support to the schools that past performance shows need it the most, though improvement resources will be available to all public schools. The focus and priority schools have been assigned coaches and those coaches have worked with the Maine DOE Office of Special Services to ensure that their schools are accessing SPDG and other professional development activities, and using data to set goals to close the gap for students with disabilities.

The Special Education/General Education Liaison is a key member of the Office of Special Services team, facilitating the open communication amongst DOE teams and supporting effective implementation of various proficiency related PD and TA activities. The Standards and Instructional Support Team consists of content specialists who also serve as regional representatives across the State. A vast array of activities and resources are developed and provided by this team of specialists, who also serve as the conduit for access and support. Essential trainings related to the implementation of the new English language arts (ELA) and mathematics standards were provided regionally in April and November, 2014 to principals and district curriculum leaders. These trainings were developed to support school leaders in mentoring and coaching teachers to implement effective mathematics instructional practices that allow all students to demonstrate growth and proficiency in ELA and mathematics. The School Improvement Team provides differentiated support to schools based on their level of need defined by various factors including discrepancy in proficiency between the super sub-group (Caucasians) and an identified sub-group (e.g., students with disabilities, English language learners).

In FFY2013 through the SPDG, regional trainings were offered throughout the State addressing the development of standards-aligned IEP goals and the present level of academic and functional performance upon which the goals are built. Teacher leaders in the field were recruited to present learning and strategies as district models of proficiency-based education.

In 2014 Maine DOE developed a policy on standards-based individualized education program goals. This policy outlines the requirements for the development of IEPs as it relates to the transition to a proficiency-based diploma and reinforces the expectation that students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum as appropriate based on their individualized needs. The policy can be viewed at: http://www.maine.gov/doe/proficiency/standards/policyonstandards-basedIEPgoals.pdf.
At this time, six districtwide leader teams using a logic model and implementation science are working with coaches to promote supporting all teachers to work with all students. Each team participated in a two day institute designed to bring regular and special educators together to support one another. The usage of data, universal design and inclusive teaching practices were emphasized to promote standards-based instruction for post-secondary planning resulting in effective outcomes for all students.

In 2014 Maine began its work on the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Maine has selected academic acheivement for students with disabilities as the area of focus for the SSIP. The Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC) provided substantial support in the development of Maine's Phase I SSIP, along with technical assistance from the IDEA Data Center (IDC) and Learning Innovations (WestEd). Together these agencies supported the development of data and infrastructure analyses and sharing of information with stakeholders for the creation of a plan that aligns with existing State initiatives. Moving forward, the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) is supporting Maine in finalizing Phase I and moving forward with plans for Phase II work.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP accepts the State's change in baseline from FFY 2005 to FFY 2009 data.

Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. **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; and**
B. **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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤		1.00%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	1.75%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-4A from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP 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 SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- (●) Number of districts in the State
- ( ) Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	230	0%	0%	0%

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
- ( ) The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

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 of children with disabilities:

- The district has to have a minimum of 10 students enrolled, with IEPs;
- The number of students, with an IEP, suspended or expelled has to be greater than 1 student;
- For districts meeting the conditions above, a district has a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for students with disabilities is more than 3 standard deviations above the State's suspension/expulsion rate for **all students with disabilities**.

Maine measures the rate of suspension and expulsion for all students with disabilities using a simple rate formula:

FFY 2013 Percent = [(number of students with disabilities suspended or expelled for more than 10 days) divided by the (number of students with disabilities)] times 100 **= [(51)/(28401)]*100 = 0.18%**

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The number of districts was prepopulated as 226, the FFY2013 value that was entered in the APR introduction. However, because indicator 4 uses lag-year data (FFY2012 data), Maine overwrote the number of districts, making it the FFY2012 value - 230.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

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

FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

Evaluation of data for Indicator 4A: Data from the 2012-2013 report of children with disabilities subject to disciplinary removal were examined to determine if significant discrepancies were occurring in the rates of long-term (>10 days) suspensions and expulsions. Each district was evaluated against the three criteria for significant discrepancies. Out of 230 districts, only 14 had more than one student suspended or expelled for more than 10 days. There were 216 districts excluded from the calculations because they did not meet the requirements. As permitted by OSEP, Maine chose to include the total number of districts in the State in the denominator. None of the districts exhibited a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days.

If a district had exhibited a significant discrepancy, Maine would have reviewed policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. If the State had (through the review of policies, practices, and procedures) identified policies, practices, or procedures that do not comply with the requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, it would have revised (or required the affected district(s) to revise) 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 these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.

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 DID 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:

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

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. **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; and**
B. **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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- (●) Number of districts in the State
- ( ) Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	0	230	0%	0%	0%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The following decision rules are used to determine if there is a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions/expulsions of children with disabilities by race or ethnicity:

- The district has to have a minimum of 10 students enrolled, with IEPs, of any race/ethnicity;
- The number of students, with an IEP, suspended or expelled has to be greater than 1 student with an IEP of any race/ethnicity;
- For districts meeting the conditions above, a district has a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for students with disabilities of any race or ethnicity is more than 3 standard deviations above the State's suspension/expulsion rate for **all students** with disabilities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The number of districts was prepopulated as 226, the FFY2013 value that was entered in the APR introduction. However, because indicator 4 uses lag-year data (FFY2012 data), Maine overwrote the number of districts, making it the FFY2012 value - 230

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

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

FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

Evaluation of data for Indicator 4B: Data were further disaggregated by race and ethnicity. Each district was evaluated against the three criteria for significant discrepancies. Out of 230 districts, only 12 had more than one student in a specific race/ethnicity category suspended or expelled for more than 10 days. There were 218 districts exclulded from calculations because they did not meet the requirements. None of the districts exhibited a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days by race or ethnicity.

If a district had exhibited a significant discrepancy, Maine would have reviewed policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. If the State had (through the review of policies, practices, and procedures) identified policies, practices, or procedures that do not comply with the requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, it would have revised (or required the affected district(s) to revise) 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 these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.

- (●) 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 DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

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

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

A. **Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;**
B. **Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and**
C. **In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.**

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2005	Target ≥			62.00%	63.00%	64.00%	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%
		Data	57.10%	57.40%	57.00%	53.80%	56.00%	55.00%	56.00%	55.69%
B	2005	Target ≤			10.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%
		Data	11.20%	11.60%	11.50%	12.50%	10.60%	10.80%	10.60%	10.80%
C	2005	Target ≤			7.17%	3.50%	3.30%	3.10%	3.10%	3.10%
		Data	3.50%	3.50%	3.50%	3.40%	3.20%	3.30%	3.30%	3.29%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	65.00%	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%
Target B ≤	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%
Target C ≤	3.10%	3.10%	3.10%	3.10%	3.10%	3.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-5 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP 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 SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan 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 (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	28,497	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	15,863	null

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	3,051	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	746	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	165	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	37	null

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	15,863	28,497	55.69%	65.00%	55.67%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	3,051	28,497	10.80%	9.00%	10.71%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	948	28,497	3.29%	3.10%	3.33%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2011	Target ≥								
		Data								
B	2011	Target ≤								
		Data								

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥						
Target B ≤						

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-6 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP 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 SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan 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 (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	3,722	n
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	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	2,871	n
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	203	n

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b2. Number of children attending separate school	21	n
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	n

Explanation of Alternate Data

Measurement:

A. 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.

Note: The numerator (# 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) are those children reported in the February 2014 618 data submission as “the child attends a Regular Early Childhood Program at least 10 hours per week” (row A1) and “the child attends a Regular Early Childhood Program less than 10 hours per week” (row B1). Data were submitted via EDFacts in accordance with specification N089.

CDS: [(903+668)/2411]*100 = 65.2%

School: [(1300+0)/1311]*100 = 99.2%

B. 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.

Note: The numerator (# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) are those children reported in the February 2014 618 data submission as “Separate Class” (row C1), Separate School (row C2), and “Residential Facility” (row C3). Data were submitted via ED *Facts* in accordance with specification N089.

CDS: [(203+11+0)/2411]*100 = 8.9%

School: [(0+10+0)/1311]*100 = 0.8%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	0	0			
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	0	0			

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

As noted in the measurement description above, the data for this indicator are taken from specific elements of the ED*Facts* data submission N089 – Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Early Childhood. Those data were reported February 2014.

As previously mentioned, children age three through age five are educated in two separate systems in Maine. Child Development Services (CDS) provides early childhood services for children aged three up to school aged five using a variety of placements within Maine's Early Care and Education System. Once school age five children are transitioned to kindergarten, they receive their education in public schools. Because the environments establish settings and schedules that are significantly different from one another, Maine reports data for the two environments separately. FFY2013 performance shows no slippage from last year's performance, and meets the target.

The data are aligned with the 12/1/13 child count data.

FFY2012 Performance			FFY2013 Target			FFY2013 Performance		
	6A	6B		6A	6B		6A	6B
CDS	54.1%	11.2%	**CDS**	*≥ 53%*	*<12.5%*	**CDS**	65.2%	8.9%
School	99.36%	0.64%	**School**	*≥ 99.2%*	*< 0.8%*	**School**	99.2%	0.8%

Explanation of Slippage in School-Aged Outcomes:

Very few four and five year-old school aged students participate in special education programs outside of the public school. Just one or two school aged students under age six receiving education outside the public school can increase the percentage of these students not in the LRE. A comparison of raw numbers from FFY 2012 to FFY 2013 revealed the number of school aged students under six years of age receiving education outside the public school increased from eight in FFY 2012 to ten in FFY 2013. For the few students who do have such significant challenges that a public preschool or kindergarten environment is not able to meet their educational needs at their young age and stage of development, an educational placement outside of the public school setting is the least restrictive environment.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Public Reporting Data for CDS Regional Sites		
	A%	**B%**
Target	**≥53%**	**<12.5%**
CDS Aroostook	22.7%	77.3%
CDS Reach	33.6%	66.4%
CDS First Step	37.8%	62.2%

CDS Two Rivers	44.6%	55.4%
CDS Midcoast	2.4%	97.6%
CDS Opportunities	50.9%	49.1%
CDS PEDS	25.8%	74.2%
CDS Downeast	23.3%	76.7%
CDS York	54.8%	45.2%
State Total	**54%**	**11%**

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None required

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A1	2008	Target ≥					63.00%	64.00%	64.00%	64.00%
		Data				63.10%	60.90%	54.00%	51.00%	46.00%
A2	2008	Target ≥					37.00%	38.00%	38.00%	38.00%
		Data				37.00%	37.00%	36.00%	40.00%	33.00%
B1	2008	Target ≥					66.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%
		Data				65.50%	59.90%	61.00%	61.00%	65.00%
B2	2008	Target ≥					35.00%	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%
		Data				35.40%	31.30%	33.00%	36.00%	35.00%
C1	2008	Target ≥					58.00%	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%
		Data				58.30%	63.50%	54.00%	59.00%	57.00%
C2	2008	Target ≥					51.00%	52.00%	52.00%	52.00%
		Data				51.00%	53.00%	48.00%	57.00%	51.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	64.00%	64.00%	64.00%	64.00%	64.00%	65.00%
Target A2 ≥	38.00%	38.00%	38.00%	38.00%	38.00%	39.00%
Target B1 ≥	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	68.00%
Target B2 ≥	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%	37.00%
Target C1 ≥	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%	60.00%
Target C2 ≥	52.00%	52.00%	52.00%	52.00%	52.00%	53.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-7 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP 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 SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	652

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	1
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	194
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	114
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	179
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	162

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	293	488	46.00%	64.00%	60.04%
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. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	341	650	33.00%	38.00%	52.46%

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	3
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	164
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	154
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	210
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	120

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	364	531	65.00%	67.00%	68.55%
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. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	330	651	35.00%	36.00%	50.69%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	2

	Number of Children
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	136
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	66
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	103
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	345

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	169	307	57.00%	59.00%	55.05%
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. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	448	652	51.00%	52.00%	68.71%

Explanation of C1 Slippage

Though the slippage is small, a possible correlation for the slippage in Maine is that we continue to implement improvement activities to increase the accuracy of data submitted by the regional sites. Maine continues to make further enhancements to its data collection system by no longer requiring regional sites to submit progress ratings annually, ensuring staff have less of a burden in the child outcome process.

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)

CDS Public Reporting Data (Part B 619)						
	Outcome A		Outcome B		Outcome C	
	SS 1	SS 2	SS 1	SS 2	SS 1	SS 2
Target	**64%**	**38%**	**67%**	**36%**	**59%**	**52%**
CDS Aroostook	77.8%	78.9%	47.1%	42.1%	66.7%	78.9%
CDS Reach	42.7%	30.7%	50.0%	44.4%	45.2%	67.2%
CDS First Step	78.2%	42.2%	53.2%	25.4%	55.8%	57.8%
CDS Two Rivers	64.8%	60.7%	63.9%	49.4%	55.0%	68.2%
CDS Midcoast	61.2%	46.7%	74.5%	63.9%	48.3%	62.3%
CDS Opportunities	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%	100%
CDS Project PEDS	46.2%	81.4%	76.5%	62.8%	12.5%	83.3%
CDS Downeast	68.3%	44.7%	75.6%	35.4%	52.6%	42.9%
CDS York	72.6%	44.6%	77.6%	28.0%	71.1%	63.4%
State Total	**60.04%**	**52.46%**	**68.55%**	**50.69%**	**55.05%**	**68.71%**

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

Maine has reported on progress data and actual target data for FFY2013 in the section FFY13 Data.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

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))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		86.00%	87.00%	89.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%
Data	86.10%	87.40%	88.70%	91.00%	91.00%	90.00%	88.00%	93.90%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-8 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP 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 SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
863	928	93.90%	91.00%	93.00%

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) was gathered from a census of all Child Development Services sites. School-aged data is collected through monitoring activities. LEAs are assigned to cohorts that are monitored on a six year rotation enusring that each LEA is monitored once every six years. The data for this indicator were collected during fall 2013 monitoring. Analyses of representativeness by gender and race/ethnicity were conducted, and respondent data was found to be representative of the populations of Maine's school districts overall.

We do in fact report preschool children separately in the breakdown. FFY2013 performance 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. **[(235+628)/(277+651)]*100= 93.00%**

School Age = (235 / 277) * 100 = 84.8%

CDS = (628 / 651) * 100 = 96.47%

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

School-age data was gathered from a cohort consisting of 1/6 of Maine's school districts. Preschool data (age 3-5) were gathered from a census of all Child Development Services sites.

In FFY 2013 Maine DOE staff mailed surveys by first class mail to parents of students with disabilities in LEAs; 7,970 survey invitations were mailed to parents of Part B school-aged children. For school-age children, a total of 277 responses were received, for a response rate of 3.48%. The data were electronically captured from each of the surveys. 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 84.8%.

An analysis of respondent representation by gender and race/ethnicity was performed. The data collected are representative of the populations in Maine school districts overall. The percentage of students of each gender and ethnicity/race represented in the survey responses are within 3% of the corresponding percentages in the statewide population of students with disabilities.

Part B 619 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. 2991Part B (619) families were contacted to complete the survey and 652 responded, yielding a response rate of21.80%.This is relatively similar to last year's 23%. In reviewing the data, the CDS State IEU has determined the response group is representative of the CDS system.

CDS Surveys		
Contact	Responded	%
2991	652	21.80

Was sampling used? Yes
Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes
Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

- (selected) **Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State**
- (not selected) **No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State**

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

Preschool data (age 3-5) were gathered from a census of all Child Development Services sites, and school-age data was

gathered from a cohort consisting of 1/6 of Maine's school districts. The districts in a given cohort are not confined to a single geographical region, and analysis of respondent representativeness by gender and race/ethnicity indicated demographic representativeness of Maine's school districts overall. The same sampling method has been used since the first year that this indicator was reported, allowing for valid and reliable comparisons of percentages across school years.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

CDS Public Reporting Data (Part B 619)	
Target	**91%**
CDS Aroostook	93.1%
CDS Reach	98.4%
CDS First Step	96.6%
CDS Two Rivers	96.5%
CDS Midcoast	98.3%
CDS Opportunities	94.2%
CDS Project PEDS	90.2%
CDS Downeast	96.8%
CDS York	100.0%
State Total	**96.5%**

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP accepts the State's change in baseline from FFY 2005 to FFY 2006 data.

Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- (●) Number of districts in the State
- ( ) Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

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 in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	0	226	0%	0%	0%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Disproportionate representation and significant disproportionality are defined as a significant difference between the identification rates of students with disabilities by ethnic proportion and the ethnic proportional representation overall within the district. A significant difference is defined as a risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, and an alternate risk ratio greater than or equal to 4 when comparing the risk of special education identification of students of a given race/ethnicity in a district to the risk of special education identification of students of all other races/ethnicities.

In FFY2013, Maine changed the calculation used to identify disproportionate representation and significant disproportionality of racial/ethnic groups in special education. Prior to FFY2013, overrepresentation of a racial/ethnic group in special education was identified when a district met two criteria: 1) the proportionate representation of a racial/ethnic group in special education in the district is 3 or more standard deviations higher than the State average proportionate representation of the racial/ethnic group in special education, and 2) the proportionate representation of the racial/ethnic group in special education in the district is 3 or more standard deviations higher than the proportionate representation of the racial/ethnic group in the district. In FFY2013, Maine changed the disproportionality calculation and now identifies disproportionate representation based on risk ratio calculations. Disproportionality is now assessed by 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 race/ethnicities. Disproportionate

representation and significant disproportionality are identified when the risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, and alternate risk ratio of a given racial/ethnic group / all other racial/ethnic groups are greater than or equal to 4. Multiple risk ratio measures and an 'n' size criterion are used because the counts of students belonging to various racial/ethnic groups in Maine's districts often are very small. The 'n' size of an assessed racial/ethnic group in special education must be greater than 10 and a comparison group (any other racial/ethnic group in the district as a whole) must also be greater than 10. The new disproportionality calculations are more suitable for comparing racial/ethnic special education identification rates across districts and they align Maine's measures of disproportionality with those used by many other states.

Maine's FFY2013 examination of disproportionate representation included all districts with greater than 10 students in any of the seven racial and ethnic groups (American Indian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Asian, Black, Caucasian, Hispanic or Latino, and two or more races) who received special education and greater than 10 students in any comparison group (any other racial/ethnic group in the district for which students could have been identified for special education

For FFY2013, 92 districts in the State met the minimum population requirements for disproportionality assessments of specific disability categories. There were 134 districts excluded from analysis because they did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement. Maine chose to include all districts in the denominator for this indicator.

No districts exhibited significant disproportionate representation, therefore, there was no review to determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

District profiles used as the basis for annual district determinations include a compliance measure for disproportionate representation in special education identification and related services by race and ethnicity. For the purposes of determinations, noncompliance with this (or any compliance indicator) results in a maximum overall determination of Needs Assistance.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

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

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

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- (●) Number of districts in the State
- ( ) Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

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 in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	0	226	0%	0%	0%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Disproportionate representation and significant disproportionality are defined as a significant difference between the identification rates of students with disabilities by ethnic proportion and the ethnic proportional representation overall within the district. A significant difference is defined as a risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, and an alternate risk ratio greater than or equal to 4 when comparing the risk of identification for specific disability categories of students of a given race/ethnicity in a district to the risk of identification for specific disability categories of students of all other race/ethnicities.

In FFY2013, Maine changed the calculation used to identify disproportionate representation and significant disproportionality of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories. Prior to FFY2013, overrepresentation of a racial/ethnic group was identified when a district met two criteria: 1) the proportionate representation of a racial/ethnic group in the disability category in the district is 3 or more standard deviations higher than the State average proportionate representation of the racial/ethnic group in the disability category, and 2) the proportionate representation of the racial/ethnic group in the disability category in the district is 3 or more standard deviations higher than the proportionate representation of the racial/ethnic group in the district. In FFY2013, Maine changed the disproportionality

calculation and now identifies disproportionate representation based on risk ratio calculations. Disproportionality is now assessed by comparing the risk of identification for specific disability categories of students of a given race/ethnicity to the risk of identification of students of all other race/ethnicities. Disproportionate representation and significant disproportionality are identified when the risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, and alternate risk ratio of a given racial/ethnic group / all other racial/ethnic groups are greater than or equal to 4. Multiple risk ratio measures and an 'n' size criterion are used because the counts of students belonging to various racial/ethnic groups in Maine's districts often are very small. The 'n' size of an assessed racial/ethnic group in a disability category must be greater than 10 and a comparison group (any other racial/ethnic group in the district as a whole) must also be greater than 10. The new disproportionality calculations are more suitable for comparing racial/ethnic identification rates across districts and they align Maine's measures of disproportionality with those used by many other states.

Maine's examination of disproportionate representation included all districts with greater than 10 students in any of the seven racial and ethnic groups (American Indian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Asian, Black, Caucasian, Hispanic or Latino, and two or more races) in any disability category and greater than 10 students in any comparison group (any other racial/ethnic group in the district as a whole.

For FFY2013, 88 districts in the State met the minimum population requirements for disproportionality assessments of specific disability categories. There were 138 districts excluded from analysis because they did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement. Maine chose to include all districts in the denominator for this indicator.

The analyses revealed no evidence of disproportionate representation in the disability categories. No districts exhibited disproportionate representation that was statistically significant; therefore, there was no review to determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

District profiles used as the basis for annual district determinations include a compliance measure for disproportionate representation by race and ethnicity in specific disability categories. For the purposes of determinations, noncompliance with this (or any compliance indicator) results in a maximum overall determination of Needs Assistance.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

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

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

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	85.00%	91.00%	94.60%	91.30%	84.90%	88.20%	86.40%	86.00%

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

(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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
1,378	1,147	86.00%	100%	83.24%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	231

Explanation of Slippage

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Over the FF13 year the compliance rate for meeting evaluation timeliness for the preschool population showed slippage. Many areas of the state showed large turn over in staff and had many vacant case management positions open for a large timeframe. These paired with high case loads for case managers is several areas of the state could be a factor in not meeting timelines. Beginning in FFY13 and continuing through FFY14 the CDS State IEU has made these area a priority. The Early Childhood Special Education TA and the CDS State Part B Coordinator/ State Director required all regional sites to submit a new Preschool Special Education Management Plan which included how they were going to ensure meeting timelines, the CDS State IEU through the management plans directed sites to focus on lower caseloads, the CDS system also increased the annual salary for certified preschool teachers and case managers by 10% to assist in retaining current staff and recruiting highlight qualified professionals to fill the many vacancies. The CDS State IEU also created 5 new Earl Childhood Special Education Team Leader positions to provide a higher level of oversight and support to Preschool Special Education Case management staff. These 5 positions are supervised by regional site directors but participate in ongoing training and are supported by the State Early Childhood Special Education Technical Advisor.

The CDS system also continues to have a small pool of evaluative providers which influences the % of children evaluated within 60 calendar days. CDS State IEU as well as CDS regional sites are analyzing opportunities to recruit more providers and how we continue to use our currently contracted evaluative providers in the various aspects of Child Find to allow for more timely evaluations.

School Aged (ages 5-20): The number of students in public school receiving initial evaluations within the State established

timeframe increased from 93.16% in FFY2012 to 96.82% in FFY2013. No explanation for slippage for students in public school receiving initial evaluations within the State established timeframe is required.

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.

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Children Evaluated Within 60 Days (or State-established timeline):

a. Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	1189
b. Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	964
Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established-timeline) (Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100)	81.1%

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b):

Reason	Children
CDS (no delay reason was given and/or delay was caused by regional site/ staff)	209
Provider	16

Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline and provide reasons for the delays:

Site	Less Than30	30 to 59	60 to 89	90 Or More	Total
All Sites	142	45	14	24	225

School Aged (ages 5-20): Children aged 5-20 evaluated within State-established timeline of 45 school days:

a. Number of children aged 5-20 for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	189
b. Number of children aged 5-20 whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline of 45 school days)	183
Percent of children aged 5-20 with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established-timeline of 45 school days) (Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100)	96.82%

Account for students included in (a) but not included in (b):

The 38 LEAs monitored received 189 parental consents for evaluation within the 30% of special education files reviewed. As indicated in the table above, 183 evaluations were completed within the 45 school-day timeline or within an allowable extension of time pursuant to Federal 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 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 six students included in (a) but not included in (b) had completed initial evaluations, but not within the State established timeline.

Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline and provide reasons for the delay:

The delays across LEAs for these initial evaluations ranged from 1 day to 52 days. Delay reasons provided by the LEAs and determined as not allowable under the Federal and Maine regulations were miscalculation of the timeline, examiner illness resulting in a lack of available staff to complete evaluations, or misunderstanding of requirements to complete evaluations.

There were no children for whom consent was received in FFY 2013 but whose evaluation timeline does not end until FFY 2014.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- ○ **The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.**
- ◉ **The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.**

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

- ◉ **State monitoring**
- ○ **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.

Methods differ between students served under CDS (children ages 3-5) and school aged students.

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Data were collected from the State database (Case-e) for all children for the reporting period of July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014. Data were verified through comparison with monthly compliance reports generated and submitted by regional sites. Findings of noncompliance were made based on these data, as appropriate.

School Aged (ages 5-20): The data for this indicator are monitoring data. LEAs are assigned to cohorts that are monitored on a six year rotation ensuring that each LEA is monitored once every six years. The data for this indicator were collected during fall 2013 monitoring.

Initial evaluation data were collected from the 38 LEAs that were monitored during FFY 2013 (July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014). LEAs submit the following materials:

1. evidence of signed parental consent,
2. completed evaluations for initial evaluations occurring during the 2013-14 monitoring period,
3. school calendars for evidence of "student" days and "no student" days, and
4. 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 2013-14 monitoring period. For smaller LEAs the submission consists of all the initial evaluations for which parental consent was received during the 2013-14 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 2013-14 school

year are identical to that submitted for desk audit; signed parental consent received by the LEA, completed evaluations and school calendar.

Data is reviewed by the public school program monitoring team and checked for accuracy and interobserver reliability.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Children Evaluated Within 60 Days (or State-established timeline):

Public reporting of APR Data:

Site	%
CDS Aroostook	78.1
CDS Reach	83.9
CDS First Step	67.2
CDS Two Rivers	93.0
CDS Midcoast	75.8
CDS Opportunities	66.7
CDS Project PEDS	97.5
CDS Downeast	68.8
CDS York	84.3
State Total	81.1

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

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

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
22	22	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

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Children Evaluated Within 60 Days (or State-established timeline):

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

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 §§300.301(c)(1), (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).

School Aged (ages 5-20): Children aged 5-20 evaluated within State-established timeline of 45 school days:

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
13	13	0	0

Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2012 corrected, Maine DOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing procedures for initial evaluation [34 CFR §§300.301(c)(1)] with 100% compliance based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

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.

Specifically, to verify that each LEA was correctly implementing 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 the parent consent to evaluate and to use the LEA's timeline monitoring plan. LEAs were required to submit the following evidence:

1. outline of training, attendance at training, and training plan, and
2. five parental consent to evaluate forms and evidence of date evaluation(s) received by the LEA.

The time period for which each LEA with noncompliance was required to demonstrate 100% compliance was within one year of the identification of the noncompliance. No instances of noncompliance remained past one year.

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

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Children Evaluated Within 60 Days (or State-established timeline):

Specifically, to verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from Case-e (the CDS statewide data base), 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.

Through Case-e, CDS was also 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.

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 State-established timeline

of 45 school days:

LEAs with noncompliant initial evaluations reviewed during monitoring received a finding for initial evaluations not completed within the State-established timeline of 45 school days. All 13 findings of noncompliance were corrected as soon as possible after the findings were issued, within the one-year timeline. To verify that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance, Maine DOE reviewed completed evaluations for each student for whom completed evaluations exceeded the State-established timeline, and verified subsequent updated data submitted by the LEAs through corrective action plans. The time period for which each LEA was required to demonstrate 100% compliance was within one year of the identification of the noncompliance. No instances of noncompliance remained past one year.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP accepts the State's change in baseline from FFY 2005 to FFY 2012 data.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.00%	96.40%	100%	86.60%	91.70%	92.90%	95.00%	99.63%

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

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	563
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	2
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	535
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.	19
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	1

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
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. [c/(a-b-d-e)]x100	535	541	99.63%	100%	98.89%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	6

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

Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday and the reasons for the delays:

Site	Days_1_To_29	Days_30_To_59	Days_60_To_89	Days_90_Plus

All	4	0	0	2

Reason for Delay	Count
CDS (no delay reason was given and/or delay was caused by regional site/ staff)	6

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

State monitoring

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 (Case-e) for all children for the reporting period of July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014 and verified by the regional sites. Findings of noncompliance were made based on the review of these data.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

CDS Public Reporting Data (Part B 619)	
Target	**100%**
CDS Aroostook	100%
CDS Reach	99.3%
CDS First Step	98.9%
CDS Two Rivers	100%
CDS Midcoast	100%
CDS Opportunities	100%
CDS Project PEDS	95.6%
CDS Downeast	100%
CDS York	97.9%
State Total	**98.8%**

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 §§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 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 time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance varied based on the level of noncompliance identified in the program.

Through Case-e, 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.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data					88.00%	47.00%	60.40%	36.00%

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 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
370	584	36.00%	100%	63.36%

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

- (●) **State monitoring**
- ( ) **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.

LEAs are assigned to cohorts that are monitored on a six year rotation, ensuring that each LEA is monitored once every six years. The data for this indicator reflect direct monitoring data. Postsecondary transition data were collected from the 38 LEAs that were monitored during FFY2013. 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 Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC). Findings of noncompliance were made in all instances and were identified both through self-assessment and on-site assessment.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

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

Various national resource centers have been engaged to continue improvement with post-secondary transition planning and post-school outcomes. These agencies include New England Regional Resource Center (NERRC), National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE), and The National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC). Specifically, Maine has continued to receive technical assistance from the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) through the award of the Enhanced Technical Assistance grant. This award began in September, 2012 and continues through June, 2015.
In FFY12 for the first time Maine used a calculation based on direct monitoring data, a shift from calculations in previous years that extrapolated data to report on an SAU's entire special education population. Additionally, FFY12 was the first reporting year that Maine used the postsecondary transition plan checklist developed by the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC), increasing the rigor with which postsecondary transition plans are reviewed. Intensive technical assistance from NSTTAC in FFY 12 and the implementation of evidence based practice professional development through Maine's State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) supported the Maine DOE in making statewide improvement in the development and implementation of postsecondary transition plans a priority.

As a result of the SPDG Goal 5: Effective Transition Planning team's work with NSTTAC and the GSS activity of integrated monitoring, the monitoring tool for postsecondary transition planning was modified in FFY12 to align with the NSTTAC's Indicator B-13 checklist. After receiving evidence based practice professional development, LEAs in the FFY 2012 monitoring cohort were requested to submit additional postsecondary transition plans for review. Those LEAs experiencing ongoing noncompliance participated in an "intensive" three hour face-to-face training, and were subsequently required to submit postsecondary transition plans completed by each of their staff responsible for developing and writing postsecondary transition plans for additional review by Maine DOE staff. Data demonstrated substantial improvement in plans, item by item.

Maine DOE has continued to provide evidence-based professional development activities specifically designed to increase the percentages of LEA special education and related service personnel who can develop and implement effective, compliant transition plans and activities within timelines. In partnership with NSTTAC, Maine designed and developed a capacity building evidence based practice professional development plan implemented through the GSS activity of targeted technical assistance and professional development. Between January, 2013 and May, 2013 Each LEA and special purpose private school (SPPS) was invited to attend a full day of training provided by Maine DOE and supporting agencies (Maine Department of Labor, Vocational Rehabilitation; Maine Parent Federation; Child Development Services). Participation included 98% of the LEAs and approximately 60% of the SPPSs in the State of Maine.
Maine DOE, Office of Special Services (OSS) staff and stakeholders participating in the Goal 5 Implementation Team developed the improvement activities for Indicator B-13. Maine DOE continues to receive intensive technical assistance from NSTTAC. The state provided a statewide, two-day Post-Secondary Transition Planning Capacity Building Institute for all LEAs and SPPSs in the 2013-14 school year. The Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC)/Maine Department of Education Fall Post-Secondary Transition Capacity Building Institute included content sessions on "Strategies to Promote Parent Involvement", "Age Appropriate Transition Assessments", "Achieving Compliance through IEP Goal Alignment", "Self –Determination", "Interagency Collaboration", "Career Exploration", "What's Out there After Graduation" and "Nontraditional Supports". Each regional team's three common planning times were facilitated by representatives from NSTTAC, the Maine Department of Education, the Maine Department of Labor's Vocational Rehabilitation Bureau, the Maine Parent Federation and the Maine Department of Health and Human Services. The objectives of the common planning time were for the participants to:

- collaborate with other stakeholders in their region through networking and a facilitated planning process, and
- identify strengths, needs, and a goal to build capacity to improve transition planning within their geographic region of Maine.

In addition, the regions discussed current practices and resources within the region, identified gap areas, and identified a common area of need. By the end of the Institute each of Maine's nine regional teams developed a plan that was reflective and relevant to effective post-secondary transition planning in their region and purposefully designed to effectively bridge school age post-secondary transition planning to adult services.

Regional leadership teams were established October, 2013 specific to post-secondary transition to provide technical assistance and support to LEAs within the region. Currently six districtwide leader teams using a logic model and implementation science are working with coaches to promote supporting all teachers to work with all students. Each team participated in a two day institute designed to bring regular and special educators together to support one another. The usage of data, universal design and inclusive teaching practices were emphasized to promote standards-based instruction for post-secondary planning resulting in effective

outcomes for all students.
These regions continue to provide TA to the LEAs in the region. Each region has a coach to help them work through the goals they have set up for themselves in readiness for implementation. Coaching support is provided via on-site contacts and ongoing consultation delivered remotely. Technical assistance is specific and delivered based on the needs of the region so that they may effectively provide both PD and TA to their LEAs.
Maine DOE Office of Special Services team members and the SPDG coordinator have attended national conferences on postsecondary transition to bring resources to the state as appropriate, and access to those resources. In addition to the bi-annual NSTTAC Cadre Check-In for Enhanced Technical Assistance grantees (spring and fall), team members attended the Division on Career Development and Transition (DCDT) International Conference: Transition Rocks (November, 2014), and Arizona's Transition Conference: Promote Strengths and Inspire Success (August, 2014). These conferences were recommended by NSTTAC technical assistance providers as valuable activities that would continue to build on the postsecondary transition resources Maine provides to its LEAs.

Ongoing professional development will support LEAs with in-depth, specific postsecondary transition planning, designed to improve student outcomes. In August, 2014 Maine DOE rolled out the new IEP format. This format, developed with stakeholder input, is moving educators in the direction of considering postsecondary transition planning at the beginning of a student's IEP development. Technical assistance will continue to address those issues that challenge individual LEAs in effective development and implementation of postsecondary transition plans.

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
20	20	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, 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 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

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.

Maine DOE reviewed two types of additional data. First, each LEA submitted corrected secondary transition plans that were identified as noncompliant. Each LEA also submitted new secondary transition plans, developed after the finding of noncompliance, that were 100% compliant.

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 LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance

LEAs with noncompliant plans reviewed during monitoring received a finding for post-secondary transition plans. Since 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 incomplete, or 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.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP accepts the State's change in baseline from FFY 2009 to FFY 2012 data.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

A. **Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.**
B. **Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.**
C. **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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2010	Target ≥						35.00%	25.10%	25.10%
		Data					35.50%	25.00%	17.40%	23.16%
B	2010	Target ≥						92.00%	76.60%	76.60%
		Data					92.00%	76.60%	62.90%	48.00%
C	2010	Target ≥						94.00%	82.30%	82.30%
		Data					94.60%	82.30%	68.60%	82.64%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	27.00%	30.00%
Target B ≥	76.60%	76.60%	76.60%	77.00%	79.00%	80.00%
Target C ≥	82.30%	82.30%	82.30%	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-14 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP 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 SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

FFY 2013 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	1,467
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	313
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	237
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)	0
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).	226

	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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	313	1,467	23.16%	25.00%	21.34%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	550	1,467	48.00%	76.60%	37.49%
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)	776	1,467	82.64%	82.30%	52.90%

Explanation of A Slippage

During the life of this indicator, attempts have been made to gather B-14 data by directly surveying the entire population of qualified exiters. However, this method has continued to yield a survey response rate that is non-informative (e.g., less than 10 respondents). Therefore, B-14 data has been gathered using the National Student Clearinghouse and Maine Department of Labor databases. Maine legislation does not allow the use of social security numbers to identify students. Limits placed on the use of universal student identification methods reduces the number of students for whom data can be collected and used to represent post-school outcomes for students with disabilities. This creates a limited “n” size for data reporting, which can impact year to year variability in performance. Slippage can also be attributed to Maine’s economic climate and its impact on the accessibility of an affordable college experience, including tuition and time away from work.

Explanation of B Slippage

During the life of this indicator, attempts have been made to gather B-14 data by directly surveying the entire population of qualified exiters. However, this method has continued to yield a survey response rate that is non-informative (e.g., less than 10 respondents). Therefore, B-14 data has been gathered using the National Student Clearinghouse and Maine Department of Labor databases. Data provided by the Maine Department of Labor include only those exiters who can be matched with social security numbers. Maine legislation does not allow the use of social security numbers to identify students. Limits placed on the use of universal student identification methods reduces the number of students for whom data can be collected and used to represent post-school outcomes for students with disabilities. This creates a limited “n” size for data reporting, which can impact year to year variability in performance. Slippage can also be attributed to Maine’s economic climate and its impact on the availability of employment in the State overall.

Explanation of C Slippage

During the life of this indicator, attempts have been made to gather B-14 data by directly surveying the entire population of qualified exiters. However, this method has continued to yield a survey response rate that is non-informative (e.g., less than 10 respondents). Therefore, B-14 data has been gathered using the National Student Clearinghouse and Maine Department of Labor databases. However, data provided by the National Student Clearinghouse leave out individuals enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program. Data provided by the Maine Department of Labor include only those exiters who can be matched with social security numbers. Maine legislation does not allow the use of social security numbers to identify students. Limits placed on the use of universal student identification methods reduces the number of students for whom data can be collected and used to represent post-school outcomes for students with disabilities. This creates a limited “n” size for data reporting, which can impact year to year variability in performance. Slippage can also be attributed to Maine’s economic climate and its impact on the availability of employment and accessibility of post-secondary education in the State overall.

Was sampling used? Yes
Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

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

The student IDs of all qualified exiters were used to query the National Student Clearinghouse, yeilding the total count and percent of all exiters who had records of enrollment in higher education. Sampling was used to estimate the count/percent of the total population of exiters who obtained competitive employment or some other employment. Employment data was obtained by querying the Maine Department of Labor databases for all qualified exiters who could be matched with social security numbers. The employment category percentages derived from the Department of Labor query were multiplied by the total number of exiters for an estimate of the counts/percentages of all exiters in the employment categories. The sample used for the Department of Labor query was examined for representativeness of the population of all exiters. The sample did not differ significantly from the population of exiters with regard to gender, race/ethnicity, disability type, or exit reason.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP accepts the State's correction to the prepopulated baseline from FFY 2009 to FFY 2010, which is consistent with the State's FFY 2010 APR.

Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		30.00%	35.00%	40.00%	45.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%
Data	57.00%	50.00%	60.00%	50.00%	25.00%	20.00%	50.00%	36.36%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-15 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP 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 SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan 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	11/5/2014	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	n	null

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	4	36.36%	58.00%	0%

Explanation of Slippage

As stated in the FFY2013 Part B State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report Indicator Measurement Table, 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 APR.

OSEP guidance directed Maine to establish baseline and targets for the new, six year State Performance Plan because the history of this indicator includes data for more than 10 resolution sessions for most reporting years. However, the State is not required to report on the targets and baselines established for FFY2013 because the State reported less than 10 resolution sessions for FFY2013.

Given the trend analysis it has been noted that the total number of resolution sessions in Maine always has been very low, which has resulted in agreement rates that have varied widely across the life of the previous SPP.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2012. The State is not required to meet its targets in any fiscal year in which fewer than ten resolution sessions were held.

Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

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))

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	83.30%	85.00%	83.00%	86.00%	77.20%	72.55%	68.52%	66.67%

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%	85.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-16 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP 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 SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan 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	5	null
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	17	null
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1 Mediations held	29	null

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

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
5	17	29	66.67%	85.00%	75.86%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

A factor that affects performance on this indicator is the use of a private settlement agreement rather than a mediation agreement. The Due Process Office (DPO) of the 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 such information. The DPO has information on some settlement agreements but is not made aware of all settlement agreements. The private settlement agreements are not included in the total number of mediation agreements, nor is any form of informal resolution.

When a dispute resolution request is received for a complaint investigation, hearing or expedited hearing, and the initiating party has indicated an unwillingness to participate in mediation, DPO staff follow up with the initiating party to discuss the benefits of mediation. Information is provided on: the difference between mediation and an IEP meeting; the expertise, knowledge and objectivity of the mediators on the DPO roster; the wide scope of issues that can be mediated; and the constructive/positive effect participation in mediation can have on the communication between the parties.

The mediation handbook is available electronically on the due process website: http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/dueprocess/index.htm

---

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 17: 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	11.22%

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	11.22%	11.22%	14.22%	17.33%	22.44%

Description of Measure

Students with disabilities in grades 3-8 will demonstrate improved math proficiency as measured by math scores on the State assessment in a subset of schools wherein the total student population demonstrates proficiency at or above the State average but where substantial achievement gaps (15-32 points) exist between students with disabilities and their general education peers.

In order to express proficiency as a percentage, Maine is reporting percent of children with IEPs grades 3-8 in identified schools demonstrating proficiency in math on statewide assessment:

Percent = (sum of % students with disabilities meeting proficiency in math in each identified school) divided by the (total # of identified schools).

11.22%=(201.92%)/18

A more sensitive measure than percentage of students with disabilities in identified schools demonstrating proficiency in math is student growth from year to year, measured by average scaled score in math on statewide assessment. Maine will report on this measure as well as percent proficient to accurately track improvement in math proficiency:

Average Scaled Math Score=(sum of average scaled math scores for students with disabilities in each identified school) divided by the (total # of identified schools).

29.65=533.76/18

Title	FFY2013-baseline	Target 2014	Target 2015	Target 2016	Target 2017	Target 201
Average math scaled score for students with disabilities	29.65	30.00	30.00	31.00	33.00	35.00

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See attachment.

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 Children with Disabilities, 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., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, 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.

See attachment.

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 LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. 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 initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these 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.

See attachment.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

Students with disabilities in grades 3-8 will demonstrate improved math proficiency as measured by math scores on the State assessment in a subset of schools wherein the total student population demonstrates proficiency at or above the State average but where substantial achievement gaps (15-32 points) exist between students with disabilities and their general education peers.

Description

See attachment.

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 result(s). 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 LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

See attachment.

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 LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

ME Theory of Action graphicME Theory of Action graphic

Illustration

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

See attachment below.

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

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.

Selected: 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: Janice Breton

Title: Director of Special Services

Email: janice.breton@maine.gov

Phone: 207-624-6676