



State of Maine

Department of Education

Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006

April 14, 2008

Revisions and clarifications to February 1, 2008 submission

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Submission of the Annual Performance Report (APR) on February 1, 2008 is the result of a multi-step journey towards improvement using the State Performance Plan improvement strategies and the Annual Performance Plan data.

Before the submission of the APR on February 1, 2006, a cycle of regional meetings was conducted to introduce the concepts of LEA profiles, levels of determination and public reporting. The meetings were used as an opportunity to show LEAs the data to be reported, how the data were going to be used to develop determinations for each LEA, to clearly lay out the consequences of the determinations, and to present the design of technical assistance supports that the Department was beginning to assemble. The sessions also provided LEAs with early samples of their data and determination levels so that they could begin to evaluate their data and make decisions about opportunities for technical assistance.

Immediately after the submission of the APR on February 1, 2007, a cycle of regional meetings was held to help LEAs understand how their data had shaped the development of the State Performance Plan, to describe the state level determination process, to describe how data were going to be presented at the LEA level, and to begin to collect and understand LEA concerns about their data. The information gathered from LEAs was evaluated by the State Professional Development Grant (SPDG) Advisory Group and the Maine Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (stakeholder group) to produce a set of technical assistance strategies for LEAs in need. The plans were incorporated into the SPDG, goal 2 activities.

Regional meetings also provided input to the LEA profile design and exposed opportunities for data definition improvements that were integrated into the fall child counts and other data collections. The data profiles were expanded to consider and present three years of historical data so that LEAs were not inappropriately penalized for short term data issues. Three year averages were used to establish the basis for performance measurements that were integrated into the LEA Performance Profiles used both for public presentation of data and for LEA determination. The profile data were announced publicly in [Informational Letter # 44](#).

The public release encouraged LEAs to seek technical assistance in improving their performance to SPP targets, directing them to a resources contracted through the SPDG by the Maine Department of Education to conduct a general needs assessment, determine needs for professional development or technical assistance based on analysis of student performance data, identify and categorize available professional development and technical assistance resources to use for use in structuring improvement plans, and identify professional development and technical assistance resources for research based practices. On an individual level, LEAs receive their determination profiles through multiple paths. The determination data are used as an integral part of program review focused monitoring to highlight areas of performance to SPP targets that the LEA must address in its improvement plans. Additionally, as LEAs contact the technical assistance provider, an initial element of their needs assessment is review of their determinations and the data elements that developed the determination levels. In both cases, the determination profiles are used to expose areas of improvement that the LEAs address in improvement plans.

While identification and improvement has been the focus of the State Performance Plan process, a number of factors are converging to encourage improvement, simplification and convergence of school services statewide. As mentioned in the overview to the FFY2005 APR, Maine School Consolidation continues to change the structure of the LEAs in the state.

During the 2006-2007 school year, LEAs across the state have been developing partnerships and began conversations with nearby school administrative units about the possibility of regionalizing, and to have conversations within their own communities about how best to achieve savings as required in the legislation without adversely affecting students in the classroom. These alignments and conversations have been guided in part by the data developed as part of the SPP process. However, it is important to note that as the school consolidation work continues, the definition of LEAs in Maine will evolve.

An expectation of the process is that LEAs will become larger as communities combine resources and identify with one another. This will help compensate for Maine's declining enrollment by building larger service areas for the students educated in the newly defined regions, but it also will change the data associated with those student in a way that will compromise comparison of LEA percentages until the consolidation effort completes in 2010.

The number of LEAs in Maine in the 2006-2007 school year was 119. By the school year 2009-2010, The Commissioner plans call for 80. This consolidation is intended to provide improvements in efficiency and to sustain or improve results for students. Maine Department of Education resources are aligning initiatives such as SPP/APR outcome data with the consolidation effort.

The APR that follows presents the indicator performance in a consistent design that will enable the reader to follow the discussion and quickly determine specific details of the report. The indicators are presented on the OSEP defined template design for the APR for most indicators. As required for FFY2006 indicators, 8 and 14 are presented on the SPP template. In order to highlight key aspects of the report, color and font selections were used for specific data and passages. The chart below provides a legend for the formats used throughout the document.

Font and Color Legend	Description	
Black (Arial, size 10)	Required language from the original OSEP template, Maine's response narrative.	Language presented is the report of progress, slippage and performance to the requirement of the SPP for the reporting year FFY2006.
Violet (Times New Roman, size 12)	Goal from the SPP	Entered into the template as part of the reporting the FFY2006 Target requirement.
Green(Times New Roman, size 11)	Notes from the APR Response Table the accompanied the June 15, 2007 response letter from OSEP.	Included in the APR submission with an immediately following direct response to the concern or issue presented.
Teal (Arial, bold, size 12/10)	Data for FFY 2006	Entered the data both in raw numbers in formulae in the measurement tables and as percentages in the FFY2006 Actual Target Data tables.
Blue (various)	SPP form	The heading of the SPP template to indicate the different form style for indicators 7 and 14.

Several indicators update SPP approach or Improvement Activities. Those changes are described in the "**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:**" section of the indicator narrative and have been edited into the SPP. The APR and the updated SPP will be posted on the Maine Department of Education website located at URL <http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/spp/index.html> by February 8, 2008.

Table of Contents

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. 5

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. 10

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments 15

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion 22

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 27

Indicator 6: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings). 30

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:..... 31

Indicator 8: 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. 39

Indicator 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification..... 44

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. 47

Indicator 11: Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). 50

Indicator 12: 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. 53

Indicator 13: Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals..... 56

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school. 60

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. 63

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint..... 69

Indicator 17: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party..... 73

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. 75

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. 77

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. 79

Appendix:

- Table 6
- Parent Surveys
- Post-High School Survey Evaluation
- Table 7

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.

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

Measurement: The measurement for reporting FFY2006 data does not include comparable data; only students with IEPs graduating from high school are included in the measurement.

Percent = Number of Regular Diploma Recipients in a High School Class divided by (Number of Regular Diploma Recipients + Number of Graduates through Certificate/Fulfillment of I.E.P. Requirement + the number of dropout for the school year in grades 9 through 12) times 100

Percent = [(1622 graduates) ÷ (1622 seniors + 84 + 414 dropouts)] times 100 = 77

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2006</i>	At least 78% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
<i>FFY 2006</i>	77% of youth with IEPs graduated from high school with a regular diploma

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Improvement activities implemented this year were aligned with public dissemination of data and determination of LEAs based on the FFY2005 performance and compliance results. The FFY2005 statewide graduation rate data were disaggregated to the LEA level and presented as a part of the district performance profiles made public with [Informational Letter # 44](#) so that LEAs, parents and other interested parties could review LEA performance and take appropriate actions. The LEAs received additional copies of their data in a profile that included determinations of performance on critical performance measures and an overall determinations level assignment. Determinations were a part of a LEA improvement process designed to encourage improvement in specific SPP indicators accompanied by invitation to technical assistance and improvement planning provided by Maine Department of Educations and its contractors.

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: OSEP’s March 13, 2006 FFY 2004 SPP response letter required the State to include accurate data in the February 1, 2007 APR for this indicator.

The State provided FFY 2005 data based on data from only 117 of its 151 districts. Therefore, the data are not valid and reliable, and OSEP cannot determine whether progress was made.

The State must provide complete FFY 2005 progress data and FFY 2006 progress data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. Data for this indicator must include all districts in the measurement.

The FFY2005 report of graduation rates was based on 117 districts in the state with high schools. These data represented most, but not all LEAs in the state and did not align with the data reported in the annual child count tables. Using child count data for FFY2005 (Table 1 and Table 4) for the calculations to be consistent with the State Performance Plan calculations, 1543 special education students graduated with a diploma in FFY2005; 79 students received a Certificate/Fulfillment of I.E.P. Requirement, 455 dropped out in FFY2005. This yields a graduation rate of 74.3% (74%). This rate did not meet the 76% target for FFY2005.

# Graduating with a diploma	1543
# IEP Certificate	79
# Special Ed Dropouts	455
Graduation Rate $1543/(1543+79+455)=$	74%

The data reported for FFY2006 are complete and accurate; these data include graduates from all 119 public high schools in the state. Child count data (Table 1 and Table 4) were used for the calculations. 1622 special education students graduated with a diploma. 84 students received a Certificate/Fulfillment of I.E.P. Requirement, 414 dropped out. This yields a graduation rate of 76.5% (77%). This rate does not meet the 78% target for FFY2006, but is an improvement over FFY2005.

# Graduating with a diploma	1622
# IEP Certificate	84
# Special Ed Dropouts	414
Graduation Rate $1622/(1622+84+414)=$	77%

The State Performance Plan has been edited to include a clarification of this measurement and its data sources. Also, improvement activities were updated.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

The State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator for graduation rate has been updated to clarify the measurement technique and present the data with respect to students with IEPs without comparison to all students. Maine set its targets based on the graduation rates of students with disabilities so Measurable and Rigorous Targets remain as originally projected. A revised version of the State Performance Plan was posted on the Maine Department of Education website located at URL <http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/spp/index.html> on February 8, 2008.

Revision/justification of measurement description: The original SPP stated the measurement as “Number of Regular Diploma Recipients in a High School Class divided by (Number of Regular Diploma Recipients + Number of Other Diploma Recipients + the number of dropout for the school

year in grades 9 through 12)”. To be more precise and to align the measurement language with the source data, the measurement definition has been changed to “Percent = Number of Regular Diploma Recipients in a High School Class divided by (Number of Regular Diploma Recipients + Number of Graduates through Certificate/Fulfillment of I.E.P. Requirement + the number of dropout for the school year of students with disabilities ages 15 through 21) times 100”. Maine collects child count data on exits by age, not by grade. An assumption of age to grade correlation was used in the previous data in the SPP and in the FFY2005 APR that used dropouts age 15-21 as the dropouts corresponding to grades 9-12. This change reveals the assumption so that data can be replicated from publish child count information on Maine’s website (http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/EFS05/public_reports.htm).

Revision/justification for historical data presented in Baseline Data section: The original SPP baseline data presented a graph of historical data computed in a manner similar to the measurement described in the original SPP (graduates/(graduates + dropouts), shown with comparable data computed for general education students. Since this measure is no longer presented as comparable data, the graph has been removed and replaced with a table that presents the numbers and computed graduation rates of students with IEPs only using the formula presented in the updated SPP and described in the paragraph above (Percent = graduates/(graduates + IEP certificates + dropouts) * 100). The table presents historical and current data consistent with the new measurement description. The revised table is included below:

Year	Secondary Enrollment (14-21 placements)	Dropouts (15-21 exits)	Graduation through Certificate/Fulfillment of I.E.P. Requirement	Diploma Graduates	Graduation Rate
2006-07	11994	414	84	1622	77%
2005-06	12153	455	79	1543	74%
2004-05	12118	567	50	1616	72%
2003-04	12153	508	70	1495	72%
2002-03	12050	543	59	1341	69%
2001-02	11724	535	53	1210	67%
2000-01	11411	537	66	1179	66%

Revision/justification to the Discussion of Baseline Data section: Narrative was included to describe the reasoning behind leaving the Measureable and Rigorous Targets as originally projected. The difference between the original measurement and the new measurement technique is the addition of the students graduating through certificate/fulfillment of I.E.P. requirement to the denominator, which provides an improved measurement of the rate of graduation of students with disabilities. The narrative included is as follows:

For the FFY2006 reporting year (2006-2007 school year), the data were no longer required to be reported in comparable form, so reporting of graduation rate was converted to students with IEPs only. The graduation rates were calculated based on the count of all students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma divided by the total of students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma plus dropouts occurring during that same school year. This computation allowed Maine to compare graduation rates for students with IEPs with graduation rates for all students. The comparable graduation rate calculation was used to develop the original graduation rate historical data used in the State Performance Plan (SPP) for students with IEPs.

Since the Measurable and Rigorous Targets established in the SPP were based on this calculation method, and the number of student with IEPs is a small proportion of students with IEPs exiting, the targets remain as originally projected.

Revision/justification to the Improvement Activities table: Several improvement activities in the table were completed in FFY2005 and are not continuing into the upcoming years so they were deleted. New improvement activities were added extending improvement work into the remainder of the State Performance Plan. The activities are a development of the LEA determination process implemented through the summer and fall of 2007. Improvement strategies are applicable to all LEAs not meeting SPP targets, but additional technical assistance is provided to LEAs with the poorest performance in attainment of the graduation rate target. The revised table is included below:

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
Conduct regional workshops to inform superintendents and special education directors of the dropout targets set in this SPP.	X	X					
Request that each school and LEA complete a self-assessment of its district and school dropout prevention programs.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Review the performance of all districts and schools to determine whether dropout prevention activities are working.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Provide districts with longitudinal baseline data for future program improvement activities.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Build and implement an LEA determination scheme that includes graduation rates as a part of the measurement.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Require LEAs to develop dropout prevention activities for raising the scores of those areas that the self-assessment showed as needing improvement.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Provide training to districts on how to develop an effective dropout prevention program.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Conform to the National Governor's Association cohort calculation methodology for graduation rates					X	X	

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
Target those districts whose rates remain above the target and provide technical assistance.		X	X	X	X	X	

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.

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

Measurement: The measurement for reporting FFY2006 data does not include comparable data; only students with IEPs dropping out of high school and students with IEPs enrolled in high school are included in the measurement. Secondary enrollment is computed as all students with IEPs ages 14 through 21.

$$\text{Percent} = [(414 \text{ dropouts}) \div (11,994 \text{ secondary enrollment})] \text{ times } 100 = 3.5$$

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006	A dropout rate of 4.0% or lower for students with IEPs
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
FFY 2006	3.5% of students with IEPs dropped out

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Improvement activities implemented this year were aligned with public dissemination of data and determination of LEAs based on the FFY2005 performance and compliance results. The FFY2005 statewide dropout rate data were disaggregated to the LEA level and presented as a part of the district performance profiles made public with [Informational Letter # 44](#) so that LEAs, parents and other interested parties could review LEA performance and take appropriate actions. The LEAs received additional copies of their data in a profile that included determinations of performance on critical performance measures and an overall determinations level assignment. Determinations were a part of a LEA improvement process designed to encourage improvement in specific SPP indicators accompanied by invitation to technical assistance and improvement planning provided by Maine Department of Educations and its contractors.

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: OSEP’s March 13, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include accurate data for this indicator in the February 1, 2007 APR.

The State provided FFY 2005 data based on data from only 118 of its 153 districts. Therefore, the data are not valid and reliable, and OSEP cannot determine whether progress was made.

The State must provide complete FFY 2005 progress data and FFY 2006 progress data in the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008. Data for this indicator must include all districts in the measurement.

The measurement of dropouts in the FFY2005 Annual Performance Report attempted to present data from the eligible entities statewide in the calculation. However the data sources and the inconsistency of the data presented caused confusion both in Maine and at OSEP. The FFY2005 data as reported in the December 2005 child count (Table 4 and Table 1) identify 455 dropouts in a secondary enrollment of 12,153. The resulting dropout rate calculated is 3.7%, which met the target established for FFY2005.

The data presented for FFY 2006 are complete and accurate; the data includes dropouts and enrollment from all 119 public high schools in the state. 414 dropouts were recorded among 11,994 secondary students, for a dropout rate of 3.5% using the calculation methods presented in the measurement description above and in the State Performance Plan, which meets the target established for FFY2006.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

Revision/justification to the Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process: State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator for dropout rate has been changed to clarify the measurement technique and present the data with respect to students with IEPs without comparison to all students. The original version of the measurement description stated, "Methods of measurement for youth with IEPs are the same methods of measurement used for all youth. Calculation is explained in the "Discussion of Baseline Data" below.", but did not actually do so. Maine set its targets based on the dropout rates of students with disabilities so Measurable and Rigorous Targets remain as originally projected. The revised measurement table is included below:

Measurement: The number students with IEPs dropping out of high school divided by the number of students with IEPs enrolled in high school.

Percent = [(# students with IEPs recorded as dropouts) ÷ (# students with IEPs secondary enrollment ages 14 through 21)] times 100

Revision/justification to the Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process: The description of the definition of dropout now cites the Maine statute.

Definition of Dropout in Maine Statute:

Title 20-A: EDUCATION

Part 3: ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Chapter 211: ATTENDANCE

Subchapter 3: DROPOUTS

§5102. Definitions

As used in this subchapter, unless the context otherwise indicates, a "dropout" means any person who has withdrawn for any reason except death, or been expelled from school before graduation or completion of a program of studies and who has not enrolled in another educational institution or program. [1989, c. 415, §28 (amd) .]

Revision/justification for historical data presented in Baseline Data section: The original SPP baseline data presented a graph of historical data computed in a manner consistent with the measurement (dropouts/enrollment) shown with comparable data computed for general education students. Since this measure is no longer presented as comparable data, the graph has been removed and replaced with a table that presents the numbers and computed dropout rates of students with IEPs only using the formula presented in the updated SPP and described in the paragraph above (Percent = [(# students with IEPs recorded as dropouts) ÷ (# students with IEPs secondary enrollment ages 14 through 21)] times 100). The table presents historical and current data consistent with the measurement description. The revised table is included below:

Year	Secondary Enrollment (14-21 placements)	Dropouts (15-21 exits)	Dropout Rate
2006-07	11994	414	3.5%
2005-06	12153	455	3.7%
2004-05	12118	457	3.8%
2003-04	12153	562	4.6%
2002-03	12050	504	4.2%
2001-02	11724	541	4.6%
2000-01	11411	535	4.7%

Revision/justification to the Discussion of Baseline Data section: Narrative was included to describe the reasoning behind leaving the Measurable and Rigorous Targets as originally projected. The narrative included is as follows:

For the FFY2006 reporting year (2006-2007 school year), the data were no longer required to be reported in comparable form, so reporting of dropout rate was converted to students with IEPs only. The dropout rates were calculated based on the count of all students with IEPs that dropped out divided by the total of students with IEPs in secondary school (student aged 14-21 in the fall child count). This computation allowed Maine to compare dropout rates for students with IEPs with dropout rates for all students. The comparable dropout rate calculation was used to develop the original dropout rate historical data used in the State Performance Plan (SPP) for students with IEPs. Since the Measurable and Rigorous Targets established in the SPP were based on this calculation method, the targets remain as originally projected.

Revision/justification to the Improvement Activities table: Several improvement activities in the table were completed in FFY2005 and are not continuing into the upcoming years so they were deleted. New improvement activities were added extending improvement work into the remainder of the State Performance Plan. The activities are a development of the LEA determination process implemented through the summer and fall of 2007. Improvement strategies are applicable to all LEAs not meeting SPP targets, but additional technical assistance is provided to LEAs with the poorest performance in attainment of the dropout rate target.

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
Conduct regional workshops to inform superintendents and special education directors of the dropout targets set in this SPP.	X	X					
Request that each school and LEA complete a self-assessment of its district and school dropout prevention programs.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Review the performance of all districts and schools to determine whether dropout prevention activities are working.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Provide districts with longitudinal baseline data for future program improvement activities.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Build and implement an LEA determination scheme that includes graduation rates as a part of the measurement.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Require LEAs to develop dropout prevention activities for raising the scores of those areas that the self-assessment showed as needing improvement.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Provide training to districts on how to develop an effective dropout prevention program.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Conform to the National Governor's Association cohort calculation methodology for graduation rates					X	X	
Target those districts whose rates remain above the target and provide technical assistance.		X	X	X	X	X	

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
Build a Departmental collaboration with NCLB resources to coordinate dropout prevention activities, planning and corrective actions in the state's neediest LEAs.			X	X	X	X	

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

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

Measurement: (numbers of students from Table 6 included in Appendix)

A. Percent = [(# of districts meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs)) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size in the State)] times 100.

Percent = [(90 meeting AYP for Reading) ÷ (96 total districts meeting minimum “n”)] times 100 = 93.8

Percent = [(89 meeting AYP for Math) ÷ (96 total districts meeting minimum “n”)] times 100 = 92.7

B. Participation rate =	Reading	Math
a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;	17861	17860
b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100);	3598	3811
c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = [(c) divided by (a)] times 100);	12301	12245
d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = [(d) divided by (a)] times 100); and	0	0
e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = [(e) divided by (a)] times 100).	1385	1345
Children included in a but not included in the other counts above.		
State Approved Exemptions	88	89
First year LEP students	2	0
Absent	487	370

Overall Percent (Reading) = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)] = [(3598+12301+0+1385)÷17861] = 97.4

Overall Percent (Math) = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)] = [(3811+12245+0+1345)÷17860] = 96.8

C. Proficiency rate =	Reading	Math
a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;	17284	17401
b. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100);	1348	1213
c. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = [(c) divided by (a)] times 100);	2683	2658
d. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = [(d) divided by (a)] times 100); and	0	0
e. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = [(e) divided by (a)] times 100).	868	847
All children included in a are included in b, c, d, or e above		
Overall Percent (Reading) = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)] = [(1348+2683+0+868)÷17284] = 28		
Overall Percent (Math) = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)] = [(1213+2658+0+847)÷17401] = 27		

Measurable and Rigorous Target	
FFY 2006	<p>At least 97.5% of LEAs will meet the State’s AYP objective in reading for the disability subgroup.</p> <p>At least 99% of LEAs will meet the State’s AYP objective in math for the disability subgroup.</p> <p>In Reading, at least 98% of 4th and 8th graders, and at least 92% of 11th graders will participate.</p> <p>In Math, at least 98% of 4th and 8th graders, and at least 92% of 11th graders will participate.</p> <p>Proficiency rates in Reading will be at least 41% for 4th graders, 42% for 8th graders, and 50% for 11th graders.</p> <p>Proficiency rates in Math will be at least 21% for 4th graders, 22% for 8th graders, and 22% for 11th graders.</p>
Actual Target Data for FFY 2006	
	<p>93.8% of LEAs met the State’s AYP objective in reading for the disability subgroup.</p> <p>92.7% of LEAs met the State’s AYP objective in math for the disability subgroup.</p>

<p>FFY 2006</p>	<p>In Reading, 98.8% of 4th graders, 96.6% of 8th graders, and 87.1% of 11th graders participated. Overall participation in all grades was 97.4% in Reading</p> <p>In Math, 98.8% of 4th graders, 96.6% of 8th graders, and 92.3% of 11th graders participated. Overall participation in all grades was 96.8% in Math.</p> <p>Proficiency rates in Reading were 37% for 4th graders, 15% for 8th graders, and 10% for 11th graders.</p> <p>Proficiency rates in Math were 27% for 4th graders, 14% for 8th graders, and 6% for 11th graders.</p>
------------------------	--

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

The data presented this year (FFY2006) are computed by districts that meet the State’s requirements for progress in the disability group. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) measurement in Maine has traditionally been done on an individual school basis. In order to accommodate the assessment of AYP by district, the mathematics designed for the school assessment were applied to aggregated performance data for students with disabilities within the districts in the state. The results of that analysis are presented in the “Measurement” box above and presented in summary for comparison with the targets under “Actual Target Data for FFY 2006”. Maine has 96 districts that meet our definition for minimum “n” size. 90 of those districts met AYP for reading performance by special education subgroup, and 89 districts met AYP for math performance by special education subgroup. The resulting performance rates are slightly below the targets. A number of improvement activities are in place to address improvement among student in the special education subgroup, and it is believed that those improvements will reap benefits as they continue their implementation.

The purpose for AYP identification is to pinpoint inadequate educational progress in achievement of academic standards so that those inadequacies can be addressed and mitigated. In the case of this specific measurement, the intent is to identify inadequacy in preparing/educating special education students to demonstrate understanding of grade level material and to verify their ability to engage with the achievement standards that all children are expected to perform. Increasing the breadth of the measured population to the district level, and particularly the number of possible educational entities from which the population emerges, simply dilutes the data so that pinpointing of any systemic, pattern, or specific problem in the educational system becomes impossible. Maine’s improvement activities in collaboration with NCLB, concentrate on schools as the largest aggregation of data, and the technical support personnel often disaggregate school level data to the individual classroom level when they meet with school personnel. Understanding how to improve the results for individual children is fundamental to improvement for the special education subgroup.

Improvement activities implemented this year were aligned with public dissemination of data and determination of LEAs based on the FFY2005 performance and compliance results. The FFY2005 statewide assessment data were disaggregated to the LEA level and presented as a part of the district performance profiles made public with [Informational Letter # 44](#) so that LEAs, parents and other interested parties could review LEA performance and take appropriate actions. Assessment data were not included in the determination structure because to do so created a redundancy with Adequate Yearly Progress assignments made by NCLB. However, the data were included in the profiles and are included in the improvement plan templates provided during technical assistance support.

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: 3a. The State did not provide valid and reliable data, and OSEP could not determine whether the State made progress. The measurement for this indicator requires the State to report the percentage of districts that met the State’s AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup. Although the State reported in its FFY 2004 SPP on the percentage of districts, in the FFY 2005 APR the State reported the percentage of schools. Further, the State’s FFY 2005 data for this indicator did not include data for 11th grade students.

The State must provide the required progress data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 that includes results for all students in the grades assessed, and report by district the percent meeting AYP for the disability subgroup in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.

Results for FFY2006 were discussed above. To compute progress data for FFY2005, the State applied the district computational methods use in FFY2006 to the assessment data for FFY2005. Maine had 92 districts that met our definition for minimum “n” size in FFY2005. 91 of those districts met AYP for reading performance by special education subgroup, and 90 districts met AYP for math performance by special education subgroup. The resulting performance rates of 98.9% and 97.8% respectively met the FFY2005 targets for reading (97%) and were slightly below the target for math (98.8%). The elements of computation method are described in detail in Maine’s State Performance Plan (SPP). The results are shown in the table below:

FFY2005 AYP Performance Calculated by LEA			
	Number of districts meeting AYP	Number of LEAs meeting Maine’s minimum “n”	% meeting Objectives
Reading	91	92	98.9%
Math	90	92	97.8%

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: 3b. The State met its FFY 2005 target for Reading and Math for 4th and 8th grades. OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.

OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in Reading and Math for 11th grade in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.

Participation in the Math assessment in 11th grade met the target this year. Reading participation in the 11th grade improved, but did not meet the target.

Grade Tested	Participation Targets	FFY2006 Participation	
		Reading	Math
Grade 4	98%	98.8%	98.8%
Grade 8	98%	96.6%	96.6%
Grade 11	92%	87.1%	92.3%

The measurement of participation as defined in the measurement table is not exactly the same with the way that Maine established its targets. Maine measures performance in reading and math separately, and reported the data separately. For the purposes of calculating the measures defined in the “Measurement” box, the total of all students tested in reading and math were combined. Since the targets were set for grades 4, 8 and 11, those values were also calculated and presented in the “Actual Target Data for FFY 2006” table so that comparison of performance to targets could be made.

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: 3c. OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.

The measurement of assessment performance as defined in the measurement table is not exactly the same with the way that Maine established its targets. Maine measures performance in reading and math separately, and reports the data separately. For the purposes of calculating the measures

defined in the “Measurement” box, the total of all students tested in reading and math were combined. Since the targets were set for grades 4, 8 and 11, those values were also calculated and presented in the “Actual Target Data for FFY 2006” table so that comparison of performance to targets could be made.

Grade Tested	Participation Targets Reading	FFY2006 Performance Reading	Participation Targets Math	FFY2006 Performance Math
Grade 4	41%	37%	21%	27%
Grade 8	42%	15%	22%	14%
Grade 11	50%	10%	22%	6%

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

Maine will be making no changes to its proposed targets this year.

Revision/justification to Improvement Activities: One completed (begin SAT in grade 11) activity was removed since it had been completed in FFY2005 and will not recur in subsequent years. Improvement activities were added to increase emphasis on two areas of significant investment over the remainder of the SPP. The Office of Special Services and the No Child Left Behind team are collaborating on several initiatives aimed at improving assessment performance of students with disabilities. Additionally, State Personnel Development Grant’s (SPDG) Goal 2 funds the improvement strategies of the State Performance Plan. At this time, the SPDG funded RMC Team from Arlington and Portsmouth to develop and implement a process that includes the NCLB AYP team and IDEA Program Monitoring Team to improve performance in fourteen of the 148 eligible LEAs. Ten specific activities have developed within that structure and have been added as improvement activities to advance this indicator.

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
Collaborate with NCLB to improve Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)			X	X			MDOE
Collaborate with NCLB to develop a growth model for improvement in MEA and SAT results that provides identification of the most needy classrooms/students across all grades assessed.			X	X	X		MDOE
Collaborate with NCLB to implement classroom improvement activities based on performance and participation data specific to the classroom and teacher.			X	X	X	X	MDOE

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
State Personnel Development Grant's (SPDG) Goal 2 funds the improvement strategies of the State Performance Plan. At this time, the SPDG funded RMC Team from Arlington and Portsmouth to develop and implement a process that includes the NCLB AYP team and IDEA Program Monitoring Team to improve performance in fourteen of the 148 eligible LEAs. This process includes:			X	X	X	X	RMC Research, SPDG funds
1. District requests assistance on the IDEA SPP Indicators that received a rating of level 3 and/or 4 (needs intervention or needs substantial intervention)			X	X	X	X	RMC Research
2. The project explores coordination with NCLB School Improvement Team and consults with the IDEA Monitoring team			X	X	X	X	RMC Research
3. The project obtains additional information/data from the district and MDOE web sites			X	X	X	X	RMC Research
4. The project staff conduct an initial phone interview to obtain more information and identify next steps			X	X	X	X	RMC Research
5. The project conducts a general needs assessment based on additional data provided by the district			X	X	X	X	RMC Research
6. The project arranges for a site visit (observations, interviews, and document reviews) which could include a special education review process (RMC has developed in conjunction with staff from OSU)			X	X	X	X	RMC Research

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
7. Based on the site visit’s findings and recommendations, the project assists the district in systematic improvement planning that addresses the needs of students with disabilities and completes an improvement plan			X	X	X	X	RMC Research
8. MDOE reviews the improvement plan and provides feedback			X	X	X	X	RMC Research
9. The project determines the technical assistance to be provided to the district in alignment with the improvement plan, develops a technical assistance plan, and provides the assistance to the district focused on the IDEA SPP Indicators			X	X	X	X	RMC Research
10. The district and project staff are involved with the evaluation of the effectiveness and outcomes of the assistance and improvement plan			X	X	X	X	RMC Research

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and
- B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.

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

Measurement:	
A. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.	[[0 districts with significant discrepancy] ÷ (157 district in the state)] times 100 = 0
B. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.	Not reported in FFY2006
Definition of Significant Discrepancy	
<p>The following decision rules were used to determine if there was a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions/expulsions of children with disabilities. Rules are defined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LEA has to have a minimum of 10 students; • The number of students suspended or expelled has to be greater than 1; • The percentage of special education students suspended/expelled in the LEA has to be at least 3.5 times greater than that the three year average for ALL special education students suspended and expelled (the SEA average). <p>If an LEA met these 3 conditions it was considered to have a significant discrepancy between its rate of suspension/expulsion for students with IEPs and the state average for suspensions/expulsions of students with IEPs.</p>	

	Measurable and Rigorous Target	
	A. Percent of districts with significant discrepancy of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days.	B. Percent of districts with significant discrepancy of suspensions and expulsions by ethnicity.
FFY 2006	Reduce the suspension expulsion rate for students with IEPs from 1.9% to 1.75%. Reduce the number of districts with significant discrepancies to 1	Reduce the suspension expulsion rate for students with IEPs from 1.9% to 1.75%. Reduce the number of districts with significant discrepancies to 1
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006	
FFY 2006	Suspension expulsion rate for students with IEPs was 0.92%. 0 districts exhibited significant discrepancies	Not reported in FFY2006

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Improvement activities implemented this year were aligned with public dissemination of data and determination of LEAs based on the FFY2005 performance and compliance results. The FFY2005 statewide suspension/expulsion rate data were disaggregated to the LEA level and presented as a part of the district performance profiles made public with [Informational Letter # 44](#) so that LEAs, parents and other interested parties could review LEA performance and take appropriate actions. The LEAs received additional copies of their data in a profile that included determinations of performance on critical performance measures and an overall determinations level assignment. Determinations were a part of a LEA improvement process designed to encourage improvement in specific SPP indicators accompanied by invitation to technical assistance and improvement planning provided by Maine Department of Educations and its contractors. Additionally, Maine has implemented a specific validation/certification requirement for FFY2007 data, to ensure data are valid and reliable now that the collection has move from the Office of Substance Abuse (OSA) to the Maine Education Data Management System (MEDMS). [Administrative Letter # 24](#) requires LEA Superintendents to verify incident data and sign-off that they understanding the requirement, confirming compliance to the requirement, and have verified data completeness and correctness. The validation will be repeated at the end of the school year.

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: 4a. The State revised its methodology for identifying districts with significant discrepancies, and revised its baseline and targets for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions.

Using the new methodology, the State recalculated baseline data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005) in its SPP and identified one district in FFY 2004 with a significant discrepancy. The State reported those same data in the FFY 2005 APR for its FFY 2005 progress data. The State did not specify whether the data submitted in the FFY 2005 APR are the recalculated FFY 2004 baseline data or FFY 2005 progress data. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must clarify its FFY 2004 baseline data and its FFY 2005 progress data, as well as provide its FFY 2006 progress data.

The State was instructed in Table B of OSEP’s March 13, 2006 SPP response letter to describe how the State reviewed, and if appropriate revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the 25 LEAs that met the State’s criteria for significant discrepancies in FFY 2004. The State did not provide this information. In addition, the State identified a significant discrepancy in one district (based on the new methodology) in the FFY 2005 APR but did not describe how it reviewed and, if appropriate revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral supports, and procedural safeguards. This represents noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.170(b). In its FFY 2006 APR, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate revision, of 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 compliance with the IDEA for: (1) the 25 LEAs that met the State’s criteria for significant discrepancies in the FFY 2004; (2) the one LEA identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2005 APR; and (3) for any LEA identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2006 APR.

The table below presents data for the three years in question. Target data for FFY2004 did not exist since those data were used to formulate a baseline. In the FFY2005 APR, Maine changed the computation method used to identify significant discrepancy and aligned its targets on the new measurements. The actual data shown in FFY2004 are the data for FFY2004 computed using the FFY2005 calculation method.

FFY Reported	Number of districts Identified with a significant discrepancy of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days		Statewide suspension expulsion rate for students with IEPs	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
FFY2004	n/a	3	n/a	1.96%
FFY2005	3	1	1.9%	1.75%
FFY2006	1	0	1.75%	0.92%

(1) The data included in the State Performance Plan (SPP) was the recalculation of incidents for FFY2004 using the new definition of significant discrepancy applied to the data for the school year 2004-2005. These data were used as the baseline data reported in the SPP as baseline data. This was done so that reporting of the 2005 data would be consistent with the baseline data. Using the three criteria for significant discrepancy (10 or more students in the LEA, greater than 1 student suspended or expelled, and a rate of suspension and expulsion greater than 3.5 times the three-year statewide average), three (3) LEAs (not 25) were identified as exhibiting significant discrepancy in their rates of suspension and expulsion. The discrepancies in these three LEAs were addressed in two ways: LEA determination; and program review monitoring. During development presentation of performance profiles for determination for each LEA, the high rates of suspension and expulsion were presented in the data for each LEA, which resulted in the determination of “Needs Substantial

Intervention” (Maine’s Level 4) for the measurement “SPP Indicator 4, SUSPENSION EXPULSION”, and was a factor in calculation of overall determination for the LEA. During the school year 2005-2006, each of the identified LEAs was reviewed for compliance with IDEA and specifically queried about the data presented in their performance profile (at the time they were called Report Cards, and had not completed the transformations that resulted in Maine’s determination profiles). The data were used as a prompt for discussion of appropriate behavioral support and technical assistance offered by the Maine Department of Education and other agencies in the state. As determined during the monitoring visit, require improvement activities or specific correction actions were highlight in the monitoring visit letters. Each of those letters required a specific action plan to correct the discrepancies and evidence to be submitted to the Program Review Monitoring Office for approval of correction of the identified discrepancies.

(2) The FFY2005 data presented in the Annual Performance Report (APR) is inconsistent with the measurement design presented in the SPP and was a source of confusion. An analysis of the data was done to determine the two aspects of the measurement in a manner consistent with the measurement method described in the SPP. Data for FFY2005 results in one (1) LEA exceeding the significant discrepancy threshold and a rate of suspension expulsion of 1.75% statewide. This represents an improvement over the data presented in the SPP as baseline (FFY2004 data), but probably should have been presented as the baseline data in the APR for FFY2005 as well as in the SPP. The LEA identified was notified in the determination process as “Needing Substantial Intervention” for the metric “SPP Indicator 4, SUSPENSION EXPULSION” and is receiving technical assistance from a consultant hired by the Maine Department of Education. The initial stages of the technical assistance has begun by having the LEA personnel populate an improvement plan template that includes analysis of LEA performance data and evaluation of appropriate behavioral supports and procedural safeguards and will results in improvement goals and supporting strategies. That process will continue through the summer of 2008.

(3) The FFY2006 data presented above are the result analysis of the incidents reported for the 2006-2007 school year. The LEA assessment of significant discrepancy was performed using disaggregated suspension and expulsion data from the Part B Reporting Table 5 column 3B number of children with out-of-school suspension/expulsions totaling greater than 10 days. Rates of suspension and expulsion were calculated for each LEA by dividing the number of children with disabilities with out-of-school suspension/expulsions totaling greater than 10 days by the total number of students with disabilities in the LEA. These rates were then subject to the criteria described above under “Definition of Significant Discrepancy”. Zero (0) LEAs exceeded the significant discrepancy threshold and the statewide rate of suspension and expulsions was 0.917%. These outcomes meet the target for FFY2006.

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: 4b. Based upon our preliminary review of all State submissions for Indicator 4B, it appears that the instructions for this indicator were not sufficiently clear and, as a result, confusion remains regarding the establishment of measurements and targets that are race-based and for which there is no finding that the significant discrepancy is based on inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. As a result, use of these targets could raise Constitutional concerns. Therefore, OSEP has decided not to review this year’s submissions for Indicator 4B for purposes of approval and will revise instructions for this indicator to clarify how this indicator will be used in the future. Based upon this, OSEP did not consider the submissions for Indicator 4B in making determinations under section 616(d). It is also important that States immediately cease using Indicator 4B measurements and targets, unless they are based on a finding of inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral supports, and procedural safeguards.

Data not reported in FFY2006 for Indicator 4B.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

Targets do not change.

Revision/justification of Improvement Activities: Improvement activities in the SPP were completed in FFY2005; those were removed. Added improvement strategies designed to provide technical assistance to LEAs identified through determinations and improvements in data collection. Timelines for the added activities extended into the foreseeable period of need. The revised table is included below:

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
Provide technical assistance to districts requesting assistance on the Indicator 4 that received a rating of level 3 and/or 4 (needs intervention or needs substantial intervention)			X	X			RMC, MDOE
Perform data analysis on student discipline and on the district's practice that generate that address, support and promote reductions in disciplinary actions.				X	X	X	RMC, MDOE
Assist the district in systematic improvement planning that addresses the needs of students with disabilities and complete an improvement plan				X	X		RMC, MDOE

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:

- A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;
- B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or
- C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

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

Measurement:	
<p>A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.</p>	<p>[(18,751 regular class) ÷ (32,643 total)] times 100 = 57.4</p> <p>These data are reported in the Section 618 Table 3 data collection as “Inside Regular Class 80% or More of the Day”</p>
<p>B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.</p>	<p>[(3788 resource room) ÷ (32,643 total)] times 100 = 11.6</p> <p>These data are reported in the Section 618 Table 3 data collection as “Inside Regular Class Less Than 40% of the Day”</p>
<p>C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.</p>	<p>[(1138 other facility) ÷ (32,643 total)] times 100 = 3.5</p> <p>These data are reported in the Section 618 Table 3 data collection as “Separate School”, “Residential Facility”, “Homebound or Hospital Placement”, and “Correctional Facility”</p>

	Measurable and Rigorous Target		
<i>FFY 2006</i>	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements
	Greater than 61%	Less than 11%	Less than 4%
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006		
<i>FFY 2006</i>	57.4%	11.6%	3.5%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Maine developed and implemented standard forms for Individualized Education Program (IEP), Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP), Written Agreement for IEP Amendment, Documentation for Excusal of IEP Team Member Whose Curriculum Area Is Being Discussed, Documentation of Agreement for Non-Attendance of IEP Team Member Whose Curriculum Area Is Not Being Discussed, Written Notice, and Summary of Performance with [Informational Letter # 92](#). Two subsequent letters ([# 13](#) and [# 69](#)) added other forms to the requirement that aligned with legislative requirements for special education students. The standard forms bring consistency to these critical compliance areas and ensure consideration of the same factors in the development of service plans, educational programs, and support activities for special education students.

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance for Indicator 5A in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.

The State met its targets for Indicators 5B and 5C, and OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.

The percentage of students in the regular classroom (5A.) increased slightly from FFY2005 (57.1%), but did not increase sufficiently to reach the 61% target for FFY2006. Also, the percentage of students in self-contained placements (5B.) increased slightly from FFY2005 (11.2%) and also failed to achieve the FFY2007 target of 11%. Then percentage of student in separate facilities is less than the target wish meets the target expectation.

During the rollout of the LEA determinations this fall, a number of LEAs responded to their data with clarifying questions about the counts of children with IEPs in the reported educational environments. Some of those calls resulted in technical assistance to the LEAs that will undoubtedly change the FFY2007 child count data. The SEA has provided clarifications of the educational environments descriptions for the upcoming December 1 child count, particularly those related to regular classroom placement (Inside Regular Class 80% or More of the Day) when Educational Technician support is provided for a child in the regular classroom, and in other circumstances where alternatives were commonly misunderstood. It is believed that these improvements in guidance to the LEAs will increase the number of students counted in the regular classroom and decrease those being inappropriately counted in the more restrictive environments.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

Revision/justification to Targets: The target percentage values will remain the same as originally set in the SPP. However, to improve understanding of the intent of the measures, expression of the desired direction of movement toward improvement will be added. For example, Maine would like to see increase in the number of children in the regular classroom environment, and success in meeting the targets would be seen as exceeding the target value, so the phrase Greater than will precede the percentage values in the target table. Conversely, Maine would like to see placement in the self-contained classroom and separate facilities decrease to below the target percentages, so the phrase Less than will precede those percentage values in the table. The new table is shown below and has been updated in the SPP.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target		
	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements
2005 (2005-2006)	Greater than 60%	Less than 12%	Less than 4%
2006 (2006-2007)	Greater than 61%	Less than 11%	Less than 4%
2007 (2007-2008)	Greater than 62%	Less than 10%	Less than 3.7%
2008 (2008-2009)	Greater than 63%	Less than 9%	Less than 3.5%
2009 (2009-2010)	Greater than 64%	Less than 9%	Less than 3.3%
2010 (2010-2011)	Greater than 65%	Less than 9%	Less than 3.1%

Revision/justification to Improvement Activities: An edit was made to clarify the improvement strategy formerly stated as, “John’s letter and instructions – annually”. The improvement strategy is, “Provide annual updates to the data definitions and data collection instructions for Part B data collections.”

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

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

Measurement: Percent = [(# of preschool children with IEPs who received special education services in settings with typically developing peers) divided by the (total # of preschool children with IEPs)] times 100.

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2006</i>	Targets must be revisited as the data collection and measurement are defined.
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
<i>FFY 2006</i>	This indicator is not to be reported in FFY2006.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: The State reported slippage in its FFY 2005 APR.

Please note that, due to changes in the 618 State-reported data collection, this indicator will change for the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. States will be required to describe how they will collect valid and reliable data to provide baseline and targets in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.

Maine will prepare to report next year.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

Revision to Targets: SPP was modified to remove the targets for this year and subsequent years. New targets will be established as collection and measurement of these data are defined in FFY2007. Improvement activities remain appropriate independent of the ending data requirements.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children 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))

Measurement:	
A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	0 did not improve ÷ 4 assessed times 100 = 0
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	1 improved little ÷ 4 assessed times 100 = 25
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	1 improved nearer ÷ 4 assessed times 100 = 25
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	1 improved same ÷ 4 assessed times 100 = 25
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	1 maintained ÷ 4 assessed times 100 = 25
a + b + c + d + e include all children assessed for progress.	
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):	
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	1 did not improve ÷ 4 assessed times 100 = 25

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IFSPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$	1 improved little ÷ 4 assessed times 100 = 25
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IFSPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$	2 improved nearer ÷ 4 assessed times 100 = 50
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IFSPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$	0 improved same ÷ 4 assessed times 100 = 0
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IFSPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$	0 maintained ÷ 4 assessed times 100 = 0

a + b + c + d + e include all children assessed for progress.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IFSPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$	0 did not improve ÷ 4 assessed times 100 = 0
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IFSPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$	2 improved little ÷ 4 assessed times 100 = 50
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IFSPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$	1 improved nearer ÷ 4 assessed times 100 = 25
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IFSPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$	0 improved same ÷ 4 assessed times 100 = 0
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IFSPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$	1 maintained ÷ 4 assessed times 100 = 25

a + b + c + d + e include all children assessed for progress.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Maine used the Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI), the Bayley III to assist in gathering information necessary to report on the three child outcomes stated above. Some sites are currently using other tools – we are currently evaluating the list of acceptable assessment tools and determining which will be acceptable for use in the future.

Description of the outcome measurement system for Maine:

The outcome measurement system for Maine includes:

- A. Policies and procedures to guide outcome assessment and measurement practices,
- B. Provision of training and technical assistance supports the 16 regional Child Development Services (CDS) sites,
- C. Quality and monitoring procedures to ensure the accuracy of outcomes data,
- D. Data system elements for outcome data input and maintenance, and outcome data analysis functions.

Each of these elements is described below:

A. Policies and procedures to guide outcomes assessment and measurement practices:

Maine's Child Development Services (CDS) system is a 0-5 system. Therefore, the population of children for whom outcome data will be collected includes all children 0-5 with IFSPs/IEPs.

A full and individualized evaluation of a child's present level of functioning must be conducted to determine eligibility prior to entry into the CDS system. In 2005, work was begun to clarify the necessary distinctions in eligibility between IDEA Part C and Part B 619 children. The Assessment Committee was created to review various early childhood assessment systems and to reach consensus on which assessment tools would be used in Maine to standardize the process of multi-domain assessment to determine eligibility for children age three to five.

The eligibility of children must be determined by using multiple sources of data and must not be dependent upon a single test score. Evaluation procedures may include, but are not limited to, observations, interviews, behavior checklists, structured interactions, play assessment, adaptive and developmental scales, criterion-referenced and norm-referenced instruments, and clinical judgment. It is recommended that observations to document areas of strength and areas that are of concern for the child should be made in his or her natural/least restrictive environment. This is the setting within the community where infants, toddlers and preschool children without disabilities are usually found (e.g., home, child care, Head Start.)

MDOE has developed a process for data collection procedures. The ECT team will review the existing data on the child at the ECT meeting and the case supervisor is responsible for collecting enough information to determine the early childhood outcomes rating for the child (on a scale of 1-7 on the child outcomes summary form). The information gathered at the ECT includes evaluations and information provided by the parents of the child, current classroom-based assessments and observations by teachers and related service providers. Initial levels of performance in the three outcome areas of this indicator will serve as the first data point. CDS sites will also assess all children annually, prior to the renewal of the IFSP or to transition from Part C to Part B 619. Assessments will also be administered to all children exiting the system who have been in the system at least six months.

B. Provision of training and technical assistance supports:

Staff from The Early Childhood Outcomes Center are conducting a training of 16 CDS teams (one from each office) on January 22nd and 23rd, 2007. This training will cover the new IFSP and the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF). Teams will be trained to collect information for the COSF and to

reliably complete the COSF form. To ensure the information from the trained was received and to ensure people are producing reliable data, regional trainings will also occur in May of 2007.

C. Quality assurance and monitoring procedures to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the outcome data:

The CDS Central Office is revising monitoring procedures so that when records are selected for record review, a review of information used for outcome measures will be included in the protocol. Error checks are also being built into the State data system.

D. Data system elements for outcome data input and maintenance, and outcome data analysis functions:

The State has modified their data system for Part C and Part B to add outcome data to the required fields. The entire data system is being revamped and outcome data will be added to the new system once it is up and running. The State will have the ability to analyze the Time 1 and Time 2 ratings from the data system. Current data systems will also be modified to capture, aggregate, and report the data by CDS site.

Baseline Data: Assessment upon Entry

	A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills:	C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:
2005 (2005-2006)	29% 19 out of 65 children are age-appropriate at entry	42% 27 out of 65 children are age-appropriate at entry	63% 41 out of 65 or of children are age-appropriate right now

Progress Data FFY2006:

Four children in the three to five age group received second evaluation during the 2006-2007 school year. Results of those evaluations as summarized in the ECO Conversion of Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) data to OSEP Reporting Categories worksheet are shown in the measurement table by number of children and percentage above and in the progress table below by percentage only. Since the measurement table subsections changed in FFY2006 to include all five subgroups in the worksheet, the additional translations provided by the worksheet were not used to convert the data back to the original three subgroups. Data are presented in both tables for each assessment category (A, B and C).

FFY 2006	<i>Progress Data for FFY 2006</i>		
	A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills:	C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:
did not improve functioning	0%	25%	0%

FFY 2006	Progress Data for FFY 2006		
	A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills:	C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:
improved functioning but not nearer	25%	25%	50%
improved functioning to a level nearer	25%	50%	25%
improved functioning to comparable	25%	0%	0%
maintained functioning	25%	0%	25%

Children with scores of 6 or 7 on the COSF are considered to be comparable to same-age peers.

Who was included in the measurement?

All children for whom the initial IFSP was completed after July 1, 2006 who are ages 0 through 5 years and who receive services for at least six months before exiting the program will be included in the measurement. Data collected was phased in with three sites in 2006; all sites will come on board starting in January 2007. We used lessons learned from the phase in to determine an appropriate training and technical assistance system to help people make the necessary changes to begin data collection.

What assessment/measurement tool(s) will be used for baseline data collection and who will conduct the assessments?

Approved assessment measures, observation, informed clinical judgment and information provided by the family will be used to inform the rating in each of the three outcome areas. The Childhood Outcomes Summary Form (COSF), which summarizes each child’s level of functioning in each of the three outcome areas in relation to typically developing peers, will be used. The case supervisor will be responsible for collecting the information necessary and completing the COSF form. At the training for all sites, it will be recommended that the COSF form be filled out at or immediately after the ECT meeting with the IFSP team. Again, the rating will be based on existing data on the child which includes evaluations (Battelle or Bayley or other assessment) and information provided by the parents of the child, current classroom-based assessments and observations if child has been enrolled in a classroom and other observations by teachers and related service providers.

For the February 2007, we report on entry data collected between July 1, 2006 and December 31, 2006. For each indicator, we report:

- a) Percent of children at entry who are functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers;
- b) Percent of children at entry functioning at a level below same-aged peers.

When will measurement occur?

Outcome ratings will be discussed and determined at or near child’s entry into the CDS system.

Subsequent assessments, which will be conducted annually, at or near the child's exit from Part C or Part B 619, will provide a second data point. Comparison of the two scores will provide baseline data.

Who will report baseline data to whom and in what form?

Outcome rating scores in each outcome area will be sent to a data entry person located within the Department of Education. Data will be entered and analyzed using the ChildLink system.

How will data be analyzed?

The outcome ratings from entry data will be matched to exit outcome ratings for individual children. At the CDS site and CDS Central Office levels, analysis of matched scores will yield for each of the three outcomes:

- a) Percent of children who did not improve functioning;
- b) Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers;
- c) Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same aged peers but did not reach it;
- d) Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same age peers; and
- e) Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same aged peers.

CDS Central Office will analyze by CDS site and by State, the entry status of children, exit status, and the percentages of children who increased ratings from entry data to exit data (moved nearer to typical development).

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Following training on how to collect data for and complete the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) in June 2006, three pilot sites began collecting data. COSF forms were completed on 65 children between July 2006 and December 2006. This represents all the children who entered the CDS system in the three pilot sites during the mentioned time period. Following the training in January of 2007, all sites will begin to collect entry as well as progress data on all children entering the CDS system.

Discussion of Progress Data:

The pilot work was completed as planned this year in the three CDS sites (Androscoggin, Bangor and Waterville), resulting in the scoring and results presented in the measurement table and progress table above. Training on the use of the ECO Child Outcomes Summary Form was conducted for all sites in January of 2007. Data systems used for collecting and tabulating results were modified to capture, aggregate, and report the data by site. Further, these data were made transferrable to the ECO spreadsheet tool for easy compilation for reporting. The activities planned for FFY2006 for the core subcommittee had originally been expected to complete in the spring of 2007, but has extended into the 2007-2008 school year so the Improvement Activities table entries have been updated to reflect the additional timeline change.

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: The State's entry data are not valid and reliable. The required measurement for this indicator is the percent of preschool children, aged three through five, who demonstrate improved performance in the specified areas. The State reported entry data for children aged birth through five.

The outcomes shown in the tables above are for preschool children aged three through five.

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: The State must provide progress data and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. The progress data must be for children aged three through five, as required by the measurement for this indicator.

Progress data are shown in the tables above.

	Measurable and Rigorous Target		
FFY	A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills:	C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:
2006 (2006-2007)			
2007 (2007-2008)			
2008 (2008-2009)			
2009 (2009-2010)			
2010 (2010-2011)			

Revision/justification to Improvement Activities: The pilot work was completed as planned this year in the three CDS sites (Androscoggin, Bangor and Waterville), resulting in the scoring and results presented in the measurement table and progress table above. Training on the use of the ECO Child Outcomes Summary Form was conducted for all sites in January of 2007. Data systems used for collecting and tabulating results were modified to capture, aggregate, and report the data by site. Further, these data were made transferrable to the ECO spreadsheet tool for easy compilation for reporting. The activities planned for FFY2006 for the core subcommittee had originally been expected to complete in the spring of 2007, but has extended into the 2007-2008 school year so the Improvement Activities table entries have been updated to reflect the additional timeline change.

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
The Battelle II was piloted at three sites (Waterville, Bangor, and Androscoggin)		X					MDOE
Training conducted January 2007 on Child Outcomes Summary Form		X					MDOE
Small group review of instruments to use with Part B children. Mandate throughout CDS system			X				CDS sites

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
Current data systems will be modified to capture, aggregate, and report the data by site.		X	X				MDOE
The University of Southern Maine for Maine Roads to Quality achieve protocols of training and technical assistance for teachers, and performance measures for young children; USM-MRTQ will develop scientifically based curricula for birth to five year olds, and develop consensus between agencies to implement the curricula.			X	X	X	X	USM MRTQ
Continuing assessment of the data collection system			X	X	X	X	MDOE
Continuing training and professional development			X	X	X	X	MDOE
<p>Work plan for core subcommittee: January –March 2007</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Determine common assessment tools used at the site level (done) ➤ Conduct/review crosswalks of tools to outcomes to see how they compare to the outcomes and to Maine’s new Early Learning Guidelines. Gather this information through the work already completed by the Assessment Committee. ➤ Compare assessment tools to the CDS system’s values, beliefs, and newly forming policies in regard to evaluation. Draw on work and experience of Assessment Committee. Solicit feedback from Site Directors ➤ Decide if Maine will require local sites to select from a list of “approved” tools or require use of one tool. If so, determine what tools will be approved. Solicit feedback from Site Directors ➤ Revise Maine’s data system and develop monitoring system accordingly ➤ Revise training plan and implement system-wide. 		X	X				Sub-Committee

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: 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))

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.

Percent = [(6974 parents respond “Often” or “Always”) ÷ (7977 responding parents)] times 100 = 87.4

FFY 2006	Measurable and Rigorous Target
	86% of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities
FFY 2006	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
	87.4% of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

The percentage of parents indicating that schools facilitated their involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities met the target for this year.

During FFY2006, Maine completed the following improvement activities:

- A statewide distribution and collection system was developed for surveys that are discussed below in response to OSEP concerns about sampling strategy. Surveys are disseminated to all parents of students with disabilities in the schools that are scheduled for program review focused monitoring. In this way, a census of all parents of children with disabilities is gathered over a five period, one-fifth of the total population per year.

- MDOE analyzed and interpreted the data produced from the surveys collected in FFY2006 to develop an understanding of the response bias that may have been inherent in the returns received. The surveys returned were compared to the population demographic characteristics of the student population of the parents surveyed and found to be representative of the population.
- Maine's stakeholder group reviewed the projected annual measurable and rigorous targets and results of the FFY2006 returns. The targets remain unchanged.
- MDOE distributed State and local results disaggregated by SAU and by CDS site on the website, through media and to public agencies. The school aged results were compiled and included in LEA profiles that were made visible to each LEA in the state via Informational Letter form the Commissioner of Education ([Letter #44](#)) and are posted on the MDOE website at <http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/spp/profiles.html>.

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: The State provided baseline data, targets, and improvement activities, and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.

OSEP has recalculated the State's FFY 2005 progress data. The State reported FFY 2005 data showing that: (1) 85% of 6945 parents of school-aged children with disabilities responding to the parent survey (which OSEP calculated to be approximately 6857 parents) reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities; and (2) 94% of 1015 parents of preschool-aged children with disabilities responding to the parent survey (which OSEP calculated to be approximately 954 parents) reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. This calculates to overall FFY 2005 baseline data of 86.1% (6857/7960). In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, we recommend that the State either combine the data into one percentage or establish two sets of targets, one for school-aged and one for preschool.

OSEP's recalculations of the data were essentially correct. Maine established baseline data from surveys that were conducted in the fall of 2006. Surveys were sent to the parents of 37,062 children with disabilities. Responses were returned from 7977 parents (1018 from pre-school parents, 6959 from school age parents). Part B 619 pre-school and Part B school age responses are combined for this measure.

OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter informed the State that if it intended to collect information through sampling, it must include a revised sampling plan in the February 1, 2007 APR. The State submitted a revised sampling plan for this indicator. The sampling plan for this indicator is not technically sound. Please call your State Contact as soon as possible.

Maine's SPP submission in FFY2005 did not clearly specify the sampling structure intended for parent survey collections in subsequent years. The plan will be described here and added to the narrative in the SPP: "Surveys will be sent to ALL parents of students with disabilities attending LEAs scheduled for focused monitoring visits in a given year. Maine's monitoring cycle is five years; every LEA in the state receives a visit from the SEA once every five years from the program review monitoring team to ensure compliance with IDEA. Program review focused monitoring is used by the Maine Department of Education Program Review Team to identify and investigate potential non-compliance in special education identification, least restrictive environment, exit, and disproportionality at the LEA level using a random selection sampling process to identify districts (LEAs) for focused monitoring. The focused monitoring process also includes detailed review of SPP performance by the LEA in key measurement areas, plus the survey of all parents of students with disabilities in the LEA. By this method of selection, a census of all parents of children with disabilities is gathered over a five period, one-fifth of the total population per year." Since preschool children are part of the CDS system in Maine the results from those surveys are also included. Here a census method will be used and all parents from all CDS sites will be surveyed each year.

To determine whether the results of the survey were representative of the population, respondents were matched on age, sex and race. Table _ below shows the results of that analysis, indicating that respondents were indeed representative of the population.

ITEM	#	%	#	%	Difference
	Respondents	Respondents	EF-S-05	EF-S-05	
Age					
3	251	3%	1094	3%	0%
4	436	6%	1573	4%	1%
5	303	4%	1478	4%	0%
5-11	3155	40%	14145	40%	1%
12-17	3227	41%	15812	44%	-3%
18-21	428	5%	1462	4%	1%
Total	7800	100%	35564	100%	0%
Sex					
Male	5325	68%	23959	67%	1%
Female	2493	32%	11605	33%	-1%
Total	7818	100%	35564	100%	0%
Ethnicity					
White	7342	95%	33834	95%	0%
African-American	109	1%	716	2%	-1%
Hispanic	101	1%	380	1%	0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	93	1%	303	1%	0%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	61	1%	331	1%	0%
Total	7706	100%	35564	100%	0%

The State did not submit a copy of the survey with its February 2007 revised SPP, as required by the SPP instructions. The State must submit this information in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.

Copies of the surveys are included in the appendix. The Part B and Part B 619 surveys are substantively the same, but language is adapted to the parents of the two difference age groups involved and service environments. Preschool children are served almost exclusively in Maine's Child Development Services (CDS) system, where the school aged children are served in our school districts (LEAs). A small number of children are served by public school's 4 year old programs or in Head Start or Child Care Facilities. Those children are included in the LEA and CDS child counts. The stakeholder group chose the equivalent question (Question # 5) in each survey to assess the number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

Maine's stakeholder group established targets for the FFY2006 through FFY2010 reporting years that were included in the State Performance Plan (SPP) updated 4/13/07. Those targets remain as established, but a description of the measurable and rigorous target was added for clarity. The revised table is shown below:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	86% of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.
2007 (2007-2008)	87% of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.
2008 (2008-2009)	89% of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.
2009 (2009-2010)	91% of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.
2010 (2010-2011)	91% of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Revision/justification to Improvement Activities: Improvement activities completed in 2005 were removed from the table. The revised table is shown below:

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
Develop statewide distribution and collection system for surveys.		X					
MDOE will analyze and interpret the data.		X					
Review the projected annual measurable and rigorous targets		X					
Distribute State and local results disaggregated by SAU and by CDS site on the website, through media and to public agencies.		X					

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
Provide technical assistance and professional development workshops using Maine’s parent network system.			X	X	X	X	Maine Parent Federation, Southern Maine Parent Awareness, Autism Society and Learning Disabilities Association in partnership with Maine Association of Directors of Children with Special Needs
Continue statewide distribution and collection system.			X	X	X	X	MDOE
Review the annual data reaching for the measurable and rigorous targets with the stakeholders group.			X	X	X	X	Maine Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9: 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))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Percent = [(0 disproportionate) ÷ (157 districts)] times 100 = 0

Disproportionate representation is defined as statistically significant difference between the identification rates of students with disabilities by ethnic proportion and the ethnic proportional representation overall within the LEA. A statistically significant difference is defined as three times the standard deviation estimate for the specific subgroup population. See the SPP for this indicator for a detailed description of the analysis of disproportionate representation.

If an LEA is identified as having disproportionate representation, a review of the policies, practices and personnel (those associated with the student’s IEP) must be done to determine that the LEA appropriately identified the student for special education services. “Inappropriate identification” would be any non-compliance in the IEP process that resulted in the student being identified incorrectly.

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services resulting from inappropriate identification.
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
FFY 2006	0% of districts have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services resulting from inappropriate identification.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: The State provided targets and improvement activities for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.

The State reported in the revised SPP that, in determining disproportionate representation in special education and related services, the analysis of means calculation was applied to districts with greater than 10 students in all five ethnic groups. The State reported that only two LEAs in the State met the minimum population requirement. A State may, in reviewing data for each race ethnicity category, do so in a statistically appropriate manner, and may set an “n” size that applies to all racial and ethnic groups. However, requiring a district to meet the “n” size in all five ethnic groups skews the data and results in the State examining data for disproportionality in special education and related services in only two LEAs. It could exclude districts that have a large number of students in one ethnic group, but fewer than 10 students in any of the other groups. OSEP strongly encourages the State to address this issue in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. The State identified one district with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services but did not determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification, as required by 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3). The State indicated that it would not make a determination as to whether the disproportionate representation in that district was the result of inappropriate identification until it conducts its review of the district’s policies, procedures and practices as part of its monitoring visit to the district in 2009-2010. The State must provide, in its FFY 2006 APR, baseline data from FFY 2005 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.). The State may not wait until its monitoring review of the district scheduled for 2009-2010. The State must also provide data, in its FFY 2006 APR, on the percent of districts identified in FFY 2006 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination, even if the determination occurs in the fall of 2007.

For the analysis of FFY2006 data, Maine changed its examination of disproportionate representation to include all LEAs with greater than 10 students in **ANY** ethnic group. Analysis of Means calculation was applied to the districts in Maine with greater than 10 students in ANY of the five ethnic groups. The analysis of means (ANOM) is a graphical method of comparing a collection of means, rates, or proportions to see if any of them are significantly different from the overall mean, rate, or proportion. Analysis of Means presents population sensitive confidence intervals that are then use to detect subgroup proportions that are significantly different than the proportion mean for the population. In the case of disproportionate representation, the LEA proportions for ethnic representation are compared to the LEA special education proportions; if the special education proportion is significantly different than the LEA overall proportions they are identified for additional review. The approach was applied to the FFY2005 data to expand the selection of LEAs subject to analysis. A summary of the data for each year are shown below.

Reporting year	Number of LEAs with greater than 10 students in all ethnic groups (provided as reference to the former method)	Number of LEAs with ethnic proportions outside the estimated confidence intervals	Number of LEAs found to have disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification
FFY2005	3	1	0
FFY2006	n/a	0	0

The one LEA exhibiting disproportionate representation in FFY2005, a specially scheduled monitoring review of the district was completed to determine that the LEA appropriately identified the students for special education services. All policies, procedures and practices in the referral, evaluation and identification process within the district were found to be educationally appropriate, consistent with the requirements of Part B and are race neutral.

For FFY2006, no LEAs exhibit disproportionate representation that is statistically significant, therefore, none are a result of inappropriate identification.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

Revision/justification to Improvement Activities: An improvement activity was added to include disproportionate representation in the performance profiles for LEAs and in the assignment of determination. This will add additional compliance considerations to the process of determinations and keep disproportionality in the visible measurements for LEAs to address as they develop improvement plans. School district consolidation is destined to increase the size of most LEAs in the state, which may increase the likelihood of disproportionate representation. The update table is included below:

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
LEAs with disproportionate representation in special education will be added to the list of focused monitoring visits for the year, or a specific visit will be scheduled to determine that all policies, procedures and practices in the referral, evaluation and identification process are educationally appropriate, consistent with the requirements of Part B and are race neutral.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Maine Department of Education, Monitoring and Program Review Team
Disproportionate representation will be analyze and disaggregated by LEA. These data will be integrated into the LEA performance profile and used in part to assign determination levels to the LEAs.			X	X	X	X	Maine Department of Education

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: 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))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Percent = [(0 disproportionate) ÷ (157 districts)] times 100 = 0

Disproportionate representation is defined as statistically significant difference between the identification rates of students with disabilities by ethnic proportion and the ethnic proportional representation overall within the LEA. A statistically significant difference is defined as three times the standard deviation estimate for the specific subgroup population. See the SPP for this indicator for a detailed description of the analysis of disproportionate representation.

If an LEA is identified as having disproportionate representation, a review of the policies, practices and personnel (those associated with the student’s IEP) must be done to determine that the LEA appropriately identified the student for special education services. “Inappropriate identification” would be any non-compliance in the IEP process that resulted in the student being identified incorrectly.

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006	0% of school districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories resulting from inappropriate identification.
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
FFY 2006	0% of school districts have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories resulting from inappropriate identification.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

The State identified one district with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, but did not determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification, as required by 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3). The State indicated that it would not make a determination as to whether the disproportionate representation in that district was the result of inappropriate identification until it conducts its review of the district's policies, procedures and practices as part of its monitoring visit to the district in 2009-2010. The State must provide, in its FFY 2006 APR, baseline data from FFY 2005 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.). The State may not wait until its monitoring review of the districts scheduled for 2009-2010.

The one LEA exhibiting disproportionate representation in FFY2005, a specially scheduled monitoring review of the district was completed to determine that the LEA appropriately identified the students for special education services. All policies, procedures and practices in the referral, evaluation and identification process within the district were found to be educationally appropriate, consistent with the requirements of Part B and are race neutral.

The State must also provide data, in its FFY 2006 APR, on the percent of districts identified in FFY 2006 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination, even if the determination occurs in the fall of 2007.

Analysis of Means calculation was applied to the districts in Maine with greater than 10 students in any non-white ethnic group for each disability, had more than twenty students total in special education, with more than 1% of the total population represented in the disability category. The calculation was applied to all five ethnic groups (American Indian, Asian, Black, Caucasian, and Hispanic). Four (4) LEAs in the state meet the minimum population requirements in five specific disabilities (Emotional Disabilities, Multiple Disabilities, Other Health Impairment, Specific Learning Disability, and Speech and Language Impairment). Population values in all other disabilities fail to meet the minimum numbers.

No LEAs show possible disproportionate representation of students in specific disabilities (Multiple Disabilities, Other Health Impairment, Specific Learning Disability, and Speech and Language Impairment). For FFY2006, no LEAs exhibit disproportionate representation that is statistically significant, therefore, none are a result of inappropriate identification.

In addition, the State must revise the target language in the SPP (for every year) to more closely align with the measurement for this indicator.

The SPP update will be submitted at the same time as this APR. See the SPP indicator 10 for updates to the target language to more closely align with the measurement.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

Revision/justification to Improvement Activities: An improvement activity was added to include disproportionate representation in the performance profiles for LEAs and in the assignment of determination. This will add additional compliance considerations to the process of determinations and keep disproportionality in the visible measurements for LEAs to address as they develop improvement plans. School district consolidation is destined to increase the size of most LEAs in the state, which may increase the likelihood of disproportionate representation. The revised table is included below:

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
Each LEA will be added to the list of focused monitoring visits for the year, or a specific visit will be scheduled to determine appropriateness of special education category identification in the highlighted ethnic sub-groups.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Maine Department of Education, Monitoring and Program Review Team
Disproportionate representation will be analyze and disaggregated by LEA. These data will be integrated into the LEA performance profile and used in part to assign determination levels to the LEAs.			X	X	X	X	Maine Department of Education

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: The State provided targets and improvement activities for this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline).

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

<p>Measurement:</p> <p>a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.</p> <p>b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).</p> <p>c. # determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).</p> <p>Percent = [(b + c) divided by (a)] times 100 = [(1618 + 6655) ÷ 9089] times 100 = 91</p> <p>There are no children included in a. that are not included in either b. or c.</p>
--

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006	100% of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline).
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
FFY 2006	91% of children with parental consent to evaluate were evaluated and had their eligibility determined within 60 days.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Maine developed and implemented standard forms for Individualized Education Program (IEP), Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP), Written Agreement for IEP Amendment, Documentation for Excusal of IEP Team Member Whose Curriculum Area Is Being Discussed, Documentation of Agreement for Non-Attendance of IEP Team Member Whose Curriculum Area Is Not Being Discussed, Written Notice, and Summary of Performance with [Informational Letter # 92](#). Two subsequent letters ([# 13](#) and [# 69](#)) added other forms to the requirement that aligned with legislative requirements for special education students. The standard forms being consistency to these critical compliance areas and ensure consideration of the same factors in the development of service plans, educational programs, and support activities for special education students.

During FFY2006, Maine collected timeline data for both pre-school and school aged children. The preschool data are drawn from the Child Link database used by Child Development Services (CDS)

to track all children in the system; specific dates of referral, evaluation and assignment of eligibility are obtained for children whose parents provided consent, then tabulated to determine the numbers of those found eligible and ineligible who were evaluated within the 60 day timeline. School age data are collected during the implementation of program review monitoring where a sample set of records from a selected group of LEAs are reviewed in detail to determine compliance.

Although compliance is not 100%, the 91% compliance level is an improvement from Maine's data for FFY2005. The data include both pre-school and school aged children, the data are more valid because they present the measurement quantities in numbers of children as the measurement description requires them, and Maine is able to report children who were evaluated and found not eligible where none were reported last year. OSEP's visit in October of 2007 provided clarification of the definition of findings that is used in this indicator and in the discussion in indicator 15.

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. The State reported data based on a State-established timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

Although required by the SPP/APR instructions, the State did not provide the number of children determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within the State timeline. The State also did not account for children whose evaluations were not completed within the State timeline by indicating the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed, and any reasons for the delays. The State must provide the required data and information in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.

OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including data demonstrating correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.

When non-compliance is documented to the LEA, they are required to consider the extent of slippage and specific circumstances that may have caused non-compliance as a part of their corrective action process. It is impossible to go back and correct the missed timeline for the children with late evaluations, but the LEA is required to provide evidence that evaluations for children referred after the monitoring visit had their evaluation occur within timeline.

The number of findings for FFY2005 is shown below. These data will also be included in indicator 15 later in this report. During on-site monitoring reviews in the 2005-2006 school year, the evaluation timeline compliance was monitored in LEAs serving school aged children. Findings from the monitoring are shown in the table below:

23 LEAs monitored in FFY2005	FFY2005 (July 2005 - June 2006)		
	non-compliant	areas checked	compliant
Indicator 11 Findings	9	23	14

During the monitoring visits in FFY2005, nine LEAs were found non-compliant to the 60-timeline requirement. Each of those LEAs received a letter of findings that explained the requirement, the LEA performance (non-compliance) to the requirement, and the mandatory response needed from the LEA to resolve the finding of non-compliance. In each case, the LEA was required to provide specific response by a specific date, in no case beyond 90 days from the date of the letter. The data required of the LEA was to submit a Corrective Action Plan detailing their steps for correction along with submission of documents from new referrals showing compliance delivered to the program review office and all LEA data were reviewed by the program review specialist assigned to the LEA. Approval of each corrective action and the supporting data were given in writing once the non-

compliance was corrected. All nine LEAs corrected the non-compliance discovered within 90 days of notification of the non-compliance. These data are included in indicator 15 in this APR.

The number of findings for FFY2006 is shown below. These data will be included in the FFY2007 APR to be submitted February 2009. Some of the findings have been closed, but verification of others is still in progress. During on-site monitoring reviews in the 2006-2007 school year, the evaluation timeline compliance was monitored in LEAs serving school aged children in LEAs and preschool children in CDS sites. Findings from the monitoring are shown in the table below:

28 LEAs monitored in FFY2006 Indicator 11 Findings	FFY2006 (July 2006 - June 2007)		
	findings	areas checked	compliant
Number of CDS sites (preschool)	15	16	1
Number of LEAs (school aged)	7	22	13

During the focused monitoring visits in FFY2006, seven LEAs were found non-compliant to the 60-timeline requirement. The reason for delays in meeting the 60 calendar timeline (In Maine for the 05-06 data we were under the established timeline of 45 school days) was due to a lack of qualified evaluators. The range of the delays was 20-90 days. Each of the LEAs received a letter of findings that explained the requirement, the LEA performance (non-compliance) to the requirement, and the mandatory response needed from the LEA to resolve the finding of non-compliance. In each case, the LEA was required to provide specific response by a specific date, in no case beyond 90 days. Approval of each corrective action and the supporting data are to be given in writing once the non-compliance is corrected. All seven LEAs are expected to correct the non-compliance discovered within 90 days of notification of the non-compliance, but in no case will it be permitted to exceed 12 months.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: 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))

Measurement:

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a – b – d)] times 100 = **[1272 ÷ (1319 – 0 – 47)] times 100 = 100**

All children in a. are accounted for in b. c, and d.

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006	100% 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.
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
FFY 2006	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, were found eligible for Part B, and had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: The State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator, because it provided data from December 2, 2004 through December 1, 2005. The required reporting period for the FFY 2005 APR was July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006.

In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must provide valid and reliable progress data for the required reporting periods for FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006) and FFY 2006 (July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007) for this indicator.

In previous reviews of the CDS System Exit data was questioned. The CDS sites were notified of the concerns related to transition and training was provided related to Exit codes and procedures with

specific emphasis on the Part C to Part B 619 transition. The data system was modified to collect all the codes related to children who leave the system from the Part C program.

Emphasis on transition increased and formalized by:

- Providing additional training to CDS sites related to the transition process.
- Notifying the parent that transition will occur in the next 3 to 6 months
- Notifying the local education agency (school district) that there will be an Early Childhood Team (ECT) meeting to address transition steps.
- Coordinating meeting date with the family and school district.
- Explaining to the family the differences between Part C and Part B 619.
- Taking steps to prepare the toddler and family for changes in service delivery.
- Providing information about community resources.
- Modifying the IFSP to document transition outcomes by age 3.
- Ensuring, for children whose first eligibility meeting is held after age 2 years 6 months, that the IFSP developed includes transition information.
- Expanding the data collection system to include elements specific to transition.
- The date of the final ECT meeting to review the IFSP for inclusion of transition needs.
- Send notification to the LEA
- Codified results of the meeting
- Verification that the child's IFSP/IEP is in place at transition.
- Any other modifications required to effectively monitor compliance by the CDS sites with transition requirements.

CDS state staff monitored sites for compliance and verified data and data entry. Data for the FFY2005 dates July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006 are presented in the table below. The 35 children not accounted for left the system due family decision or choice. CDS policies require that existing plans be reviewed and modified before transition so that existing services are uninterrupted by transition to Part B 619. That means that all children have implemented IFSP/IEPs at transition.

$$\text{Percent} = 1253 \div (1291 - 3 - 35) \text{ times } 100 = 100$$

FFY2005 data (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006)		
a.	1291	children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
b.	3	of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
c.	1253	of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
d.	35	not accounted for in a., b., and c.

Data for the FFY2006 dates July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007 are presented in the table below. Again, the 47 children not accounted for left the system due family decision or choice.

Percent = $1272 \div (1319 - 0 - 47) \text{ times } 100 = 100$

FFY2006 data (July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007)		
a.	1319	children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
b.	0	of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
c.	1272	of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
d.	47	not accounted for in a., b., and c.

These data demonstrate that transition from Part C, to Part B 619 services are occurring within timelines.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

Revision/justification to the Improvement Activities table: The improvement activity indicating that CDS state staff will continue to monitor sites for compliance and verify data and data entry. Based on findings, continue to provide ongoing professional development and trainings to enhance understanding and compliance. This activity remains in the SPP for the remaining years of the SPP, but the improvement activities completed in FFY2005 that will not be repeated in subsequent years were removed. The revised table is included below:

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
Monitor sites for compliance and verify data and data entry. Based on findings, continue to provide ongoing professional development and trainings to enhance understanding and compliance.		X	X	X	X	X	

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

[(123 acceptable plans) ÷ (208 youth 16 and above with IEPs)] times 100 = 59

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006	100% of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
FFY 2006	59% of youth aged 16 and above have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.

OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.320(b), including data demonstrating correction of compliance identified in FFY 2005.

Maine developed and implemented standard forms for Individualized Education Program (IEP), Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP), Written Agreement for IEP Amendment, Documentation for Excusal of IEP Team Member Whose Curriculum Area Is Being Discussed, Documentation of Agreement for Non-Attendance of IEP Team Member Whose Curriculum Area Is Not Being Discussed, Written Notice, and Summary of Performance with [Informational Letter # 92](#). Two subsequent letters ([# 13](#) and [# 69](#)) added other forms to the requirement that aligned with legislative

requirements for special education students. The standard forms bring consistency to these critical compliance areas and ensure consideration of the same factors in the development of service plans, educational programs, and support activities for special education students.

Transition data were collected during the implementation of program review monitoring where a sample set of records from a selected group of 22 LEAs were reviewed in detail to determine compliance. Six elements in the Pupil Record Audit Form were used to determine compliance with the law. Failure of any one of the 6 elements can result in a finding for the LEA, but the number of acceptable plans stated in the measurement above is the number of files of children age 16 found to be compliant with the six transition elements in the PRAF. Therefore, of the 208 files of children age 16 reviewed in 22 LEAs during the 2006-2007 school year, 123 were found to be fully compliant. This result is a 59% compliance rate. Corrective actions were required to be completed for EACH file found non-compliant. Discrepancies in those files were required to be corrected immediately and submitted for review by the program review office and all LEA data were reviewed by the program review specialist assigned to the LEA.

The six regulatory sections that are components of the data for Indicator 13 are:

1. For age 14-20 and younger, if appropriate... if purpose of meeting is consideration of the post secondary goals and needed transition service needs that focuses on the student's course of study and updated annually, notice of the meeting must indicate:

The purpose of the meeting is to consider post secondary goals and transition services.
IDEIA '06' Regs.: 34CFR §300.322 (b)

2. Agency must invite the student at age 14 – 20 and younger, if appropriate
IDEIA '06' Reg 34CFR § 300.322(b)
3. With parental written consent, identify any other agency that will be invited to send a representative. IDEIA '06' Regs.: 34CFR § 300.322(b)
4. For each student beginning no later than the IEP to be in effect when the child turns 14 and updated annually thereafter...,
 - A. Appropriate measurable post-secondary goals based upon age-appropriate transition assessments related to training, education, employment, and where appropriate independent living skills IDEIA '06' Regs.: 34CFR §300.43 and 34CFR §300.320 (a)(7)(b)(1)(2)
5. If post Secondary goals and transition services were discussed and student did not attend IEP meeting, steps taken to ensure the student's preferences and interests were considered. IDEIA '06' Regs.: 34CFR §300.321(b)(2)
6. The IEP must include the transition services (including courses of study) needed to assist the child in reaching those goals. (Transition services include: Instruction, Related Services, Community Experiences, the development of employment and other post-school adult living objectives and if appropriate, acquisition of daily living skills and provision of functional vocational evaluation.)

Maine will be reviewing its monitoring program to bring additional clarity to the measurement of measurable, annual IEP goals. If any of the items above is found to be absent on an IEP for a student at transition results in a finding. Upon review of the monitoring guidelines and the specific language of the indicator, it appears that monitoring may be addressing this measure more aggressively than is required. At the same time, it is important to keep on top of critical aspects of LEA practice to avoid factors known to be contributing to some of the non-compliance. An improvement activity will be added to the SPP to thoroughly explore the focused monitoring process and bring appropriate balance to the measurement of transition goals.

Those files found non-compliant became the basis for finding of non-compliance in the LEA. Any file or number of files found non-compliant in a given LEA resulting in a finding for that LEA. The number of findings for FFY2005 is shown below. These data ~~will also be~~ are included in indicator 15 later in this report. During on-site monitoring reviews in the 2005-2006 school year, the evaluation timeline compliance was monitored in LEAs serving school aged children. Findings from the monitoring are shown in the table below:

23 LEAs monitored in FFY2005	FFY2005 (July 2005 - June 2006)		
	findings	areas checked	compliant
Indicator 13 Findings	14	23	9

During the monitoring visits in FFY2005, ten LEAs were found non-compliant to the transition requirement. Each of those LEAs received a letter of findings that explained the requirement, the LEA performance (non-compliance) to the requirement, and the mandatory response needed from the LEA to resolve the finding of non-compliance. In each case, the LEA was required to provide specific response by a specific date, in no case beyond 90 days from the date of the letter. Approval of each corrective action and the supporting data were given in writing once the non-compliance was corrected. All ten LEAs corrected the non-compliance discovered within 90 days of notification of the non-compliance. These data are included in indicator 15 in this APR.

The number of findings for FFY2006 is shown below. These data will be included in the FFY2007 APR to be submitted February 2009. Some of the findings have been closed, but verification of others is still in progress. During on-site monitoring reviews in the 2006-2007 school year, the evaluation timeline compliance was monitored in LEAs serving school aged children in LEAs and preschool children in CDS sites. Findings from the monitoring are shown in the table below:

22 LEAs Monitored in FFY2006	FFY2006 (July 2006 - June 2007)		
	findings	areas checked	compliant
Indicator 13 Findings	18	22	4

During the focused monitoring visits in FFY2006, eighteen LEAs were found non-compliant to the transition requirement. Each of those LEAs received a letter of findings that explained the requirement, the LEA performance (non-compliance) to the requirement, and the mandatory response needed from the LEA to resolve the finding of non-compliance. In each case, the LEA was required to provide specific response by a specific date, in no case beyond 90 days. Approval of each corrective action and the supporting data are to be given in writing once the non-compliance is corrected. All eighteen LEAs are expected to correct the non-compliance discovered within 90 days of notification of the non-compliance, but in no case will it be permitted to exceed 12 months.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

Revision/justification to Improvement Activities: Maine will be reviewing its monitoring program to bring additional clarity to the measurement of measurable, annual IEP goals. Upon review of the monitoring guidelines and the specific language of the indicator, it appears that monitoring may be addressing this measure more aggressively than is required. An improvement activity ~~will be~~ was added to the SPP to thoroughly explore the process and bring appropriate balance to the measurement of transition goals. The revised table is included below:

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
Monitoring reviews performed on site at each LEA once every five years.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Maine Department of Education Monitoring Team
Technical assistance and professional development will be provided to LEAs who have not met the target.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Maine Department of Education Monitoring Team
Ed O'Leary's training protocol, used by the Maine Transition Outcomes Project, will become part of the technical assistance package delivered by MTN/COT regional sites.		X	X	X	X	X	MTN-COT
Review the protocol and specific questions used in focused monitoring to capture data on the assessment of the number of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals			X	X			MDOE

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.

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

Measurement:

Percent = # of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school divided by # of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school times 100.

Percent = (421 competitively employed or in some form of postsecondary school, or both) ÷ (497 respondents no longer in secondary school) time 100 = 85

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Maine initially began collecting post high school data in the State Improvement Grant (SIG) under Goal 1: "Determine baseline and yearly the numbers of students with disabilities entering post-secondary education or employment." This led to the development of the Maine YES (Youth Exiting Schools) project. In that project, special education students and general education students were matched on a number of demographic variables such as age and gender.

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter informed the State, that if it intended to collect information through sampling, it must include a revised sampling plan in the February 1, 2007 APR. The State submitted a revised sampling plan. The sampling plan for this indicator is not technically sound. Please call your State Contact as soon as possible.

It was decided to survey all students with IEPs in order to establish a baseline for this indicator. The target population for those exiting school in the 2004-05 school year was 2,097 youth in all exit categories (graduated, dropped out, aged out, etc.). Contact information was requested for these students and eventually a total of 626 were successfully contacted. Of these, 129 refused to take the survey leaving a respondent sample 497. This process will be repeated in subsequent years; a census of all students exiting high school by any exit method will be done, not a sample. Data collection will be conducted one year after the cohort group exits high school.

Individual responses from the survey are counted as *competitively employed* using answers to three questions: "DO YOU CURRENTLY HAVE A PAYING JOB?" answered "Yes" AND "WHAT IS YOUR SALARY ON THIS JOB?" answered "Above minimum wage (>\$6.50)", plus the answer "Yes" to "ARE YOU IN THE MILITARY?" Individual responses from the survey are counted as *enrolled in some type of postsecondary school* using the answer "Yes" to the question "ARE YOU IN SCHOOL NOW?"

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: The State provided a plan that describes how the data will be collected. The State must provide baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.

Maine

Of the 497 students responding, 211 or 42% were employed at a wage above \$6.50. Fifteen or 3% of the 497 are in the military. Of the 497 195 or 39% are currently in school. 85% $((211+15+195)/497)$ of the responding students were competitively employed or in postsecondary school.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The table below shows data from the NPSO calculator used to analyze the survey responses. All student subgroups are represented in the data in proportions very closely correlated to the proportions overall in the state, so no response bias weighting factors have been applied to these data. A thorough analysis of response representation and characteristics is included in the Appendix.

Statewide Response Rate		24%		Respondents by Gender		Count	%
				Female	117	24%	
Characteristic	Count			Male	380	76%	
Statewide Respondents	497			Unknown: Gender	0	0%	
					497	100%	
Respondents by Ethnicity		Count	%	Respondents by Exit Type		Count	%
White	467	94%	High School Diploma	382	77%		
Hispanic	7	1%	Certificate or Modified Diploma	28	6%		
Black	12	2%	Aged out (maximum age)	5	1%		
Asian or Pacific Islander	6	1%	Dropout	82	16%		
American Indian or Alaska Native	5	1%	Unknown: Exit Reason	0	0%		
Unknown/Other Ethnicity	0	0%					
		497	100%		497	100%	
Respondents by Type of Disability		Count	%	Respondents by Type of Disability		Count	%
Specific Learning Disability	207	42%	Specific Learning Disability	207	42%		
Emotional Disturbance	57	11%	Emotional Disturbance	57	11%		
Mental Retardation	24	5%	Mental Retardation	24	5%		
Other Health Impairment	75	15%	All Other Disabilities	208	42%		
Multiple Disabilities	72	14%	Unknown: Disability Type	1	0%		
Speech or Language Impairment	35	7%				497	100%
Autism	15	3%					
Hearing Impairments	4	1%					
Traumatic Brain Injury	5	1%					
Orthopedic Impairment	0	0%					
Visual Impairment including blindness	1	0%					
Deafness	1	0%					
Deaf-Blindness	0	0%					
Unknown: Disability Type	1	0%					
		497	100%				

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Not reported
2006 (2006-2007)	Baseline data: 85% of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and are competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school
2007 (2007-2008)	85% of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and are competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school
2008 (2008-2009)	86% of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and are competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school
2009 (2009-2010)	87% of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and are competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school
2010 (2010-2011)	88% of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and are competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
Maine Transition Network for Committee on Transition was contracted to use their six regional sites and “Leadership for Youth” program to increase familiarity with the survey and appropriate response when contacted a year beyond graduation.		X	X	X	X	X	
“The survey of June 06 graduates will be revised to include a question(s) to determine if the graduate is considered competitively employed. A question should ask how many hours a week do you work?”		X					

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development for Indicator 15:

Focused monitoring is used by the Maine Department of Education Program Review Team to identify and investigate potential non-compliance in special education identification, least restrictive environment, exit, and disproportionality at the LEA level using a random selection sampling process to identify districts (LEAs) for focused monitoring. The following method was used to determine a representative sampling plan over the next five years that can work in conjunction with Maine’s Program Review cycle.

- A. Districts were sorted from lowest to highest on the basis of number of students with IEPs.
- B. Each district was then assigned a random number between 1 and 5 using the “randbetween” function. NOTE: Although the SPP calls for LEAs to be sampled at least once every six years, Maine’s monitoring has a five-year rotation. Hence, the decision was made to conform to Maine’s monitoring cycle.
- C. Districts were then sorted based on which random number they received.
- D. This method divides districts into 5 relatively heterogeneous groups with a maximum variance in the number of students with IEPs of approximately 4 percent.

Year 1 – 8700, Year 2 – 8376, Year 3 – 8321, Year 4 – 8698, Year 5 – 8664

- E. The method allows LEAs to be switched, as necessary, based on the needs of the program review committee.

LEA data are developed into a set of specific measurements that identify significant deviations from State averages for each compliance area. These data are used as part of the Program Review Compliance Monitoring visit for the LEA along with a detailed review of student IEPs using the state developed Pupil Record Audit Form. Any identified non-compliances discovered are documented by letter to the LEA with the requirement for a corrective action plan to be developed by the LEA for approval by the monitoring team. Within one year from the date of the Letter of Verification all areas of noncompliance must be corrected.

The Due Process Office (DPO) monitors complaint investigations and hearings on an ongoing basis using a database system (DOCKET) to track activities and timelines for compliance. Non-compliance corrective actions are tracked in a separate database (CAP) that monitors the case number, critical dates, violations and the corrective action activities associated with the case and the resolution of the non-compliance. Critical dates include the required dates of documentation marking compliance with elements of the corrective actions that will reconcile the non-compliance. These dates also trigger follow-up from the Due Process Office to ensure that corrective actions are completed on time.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

Measurement:
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100 = $30 \div 40 = 75$
--

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006	100% of non-compliance corrected within one year.
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
FFY 2006	75% of non-compliance corrected within one year.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

The NCSEAM Indicator B-15 Worksheet was used to account for all findings in FFY2005 that were corrected in FFY2006. The worksheet is included below:

INDICATOR B-15 WORKSHEET (8/2/07-revised 11/15/2007)

Data to include in the FFY2006 APR regarding finding for FFY2005 resolved within 12 months

Indicator	General Supervision System Components	# of Programs Monitored	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 (7/1/05 – 6/30/06)	(b) # of Findings from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. 2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. 13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable student to meet the post-secondary goals. 14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.	Monitoring: On-site visits, self-assessment, local APR, desk audit, etc. Source: B-13	23	14	5
	Dispute Resolution			
	Other: Specify			

INDICATOR B-15 WORKSHEET (8/2/07-revised 11/15/2007)

Data to include in the FFY2006 APR regarding finding for FFY2005 resolved within 12 months

Indicator	General Supervision System Components	# of Programs Monitored	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 (7/1/05 – 6/30/06)	(b) # of Findings from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments. 7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.	Monitoring: On-site visits, self-assessment, local APR, desk audit, etc.			
	Dispute Resolution			
	Other: Specify			
4A. Percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year	Monitoring: On-site visits, self-assessment, local APR, desk audit, etc.			
	Dispute Resolution			
	Other: Specify			
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 -educational placements. 6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement.	Monitoring: On-site visits, self-assessment, local APR, desk audit, etc.			
	Dispute Resolution Source: 2005CAP	105	16	15
	Other: Specify			
7. 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.	Monitoring: On-site visits, self-assessment, local APR, desk audit, etc.			
	Dispute Resolution			
	Other: Specify			
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification. 10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate	Monitoring: On-site visits, self-assessment, local APR, desk audit, etc.			
	Dispute Resolution			
	Other: Specify Disproportionality analysis Source: B-9, B-10	155	1	1

INDICATOR B-15 WORKSHEET (8/2/07-revised 11/15/2007)

Data to include in the FFY2006 APR regarding finding for FFY2005 resolved within 12 months

Indicator	General Supervision System Components	# of Programs Monitored	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 (7/1/05 – 6/30/06)	(b) # of Findings from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
identification.				
11. 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.	Monitoring: On-site visits, self-assessment, local APR, desk audit, etc. Source: B-11	23	9	9
	Dispute Resolution			
	Other: Specify			
12. 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.	Monitoring: On-site visits, self-assessment, local APR, desk audit, etc.			
	Dispute Resolution			
	Other: Specify			
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			40	30

For the 2005-06 school year, the data is correct for general supervision for the monitoring process for school units serving Part B (school aged students) There were 23 school units that received a verification visit: 14 school units demonstrated correction within 12 months, 5 demonstrated correction within 13 months and 4 received State imposed Sanctions. One LEA review was postponed to 2006-2007. The individual compliance correction of findings concerning specific indicator violations is divided into the specific indicator section in the chart. Program review used verification letters to capture dates for notification of non-compliance (findings) to LEAs, and record the resolution of those non-compliance as responses, data, and other evidence are returned from the LEA. Tracking of responses in 2006-2007 is being disaggregated by indicator to simplify reporting.

Fifteen of sixteen dispute resolutions findings were resolved within the twelve month required timeline. The Corrective Action period for one Dispute Resolution case that closed in 405 days was complex and lengthy due to:

1. Confusion within the family and between the family and the SAU about what a Corrective Action Plan was and what the Corrective Action Plan required;
2. The necessity of an amendment to the Corrective Action Plan to clear up the confusion; and,
3. The SAU's provision of the compensatory education services to the child.

The amended Corrective Action Plan provided technical assistance to both parties regarding the requirements of the order that ensured clear understanding by both parties.

Maine developed and implemented standard forms for Individualized Education Program (IEP), Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP), Written Agreement for IEP Amendment, Documentation for Excusal of IEP Team Member Whose Curriculum Area Is Being Discussed, Documentation of Agreement for Non-Attendance of IEP Team Member Whose Curriculum Area Is Not Being Discussed, Written Notice, and Summary of Performance with [Informational Letter # 92](#). Two subsequent letters ([# 13](#) and [# 69](#)) added other forms to the requirement that aligned with legislative requirements for special education students. The standard forms bring consistency to these critical compliance areas and ensure consideration of the same factors in the development of service plans, educational programs, and support activities for special education students.

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: The State did not, as required by the instructions, recalculate the baseline for this indicator to provide a single baseline for this indicator, rather than separate baselines for the former indicators 15A, 15B, and 15C.

The method for calculation has been changed to the single measurement required. The State Performance Plan (SPP) for indicator 15 has been updated to reflect the change. Individual findings from focused monitoring and dispute resolution are recorded on the NCSEAM Indicator B-15 Worksheet and summed to produce the values entered into the Measurement box above to compute the compliance percentage.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: OSEP’s March 13, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR: (1) the required data and calculations in reporting its performance on this indicator; (2) documentation that it was effectively identifying and correcting noncompliance related to services for school-aged and preschool-aged children with disabilities that are publicly placed in private, special-purpose schools; (3) data specific to the correction of noncompliance regarding the provision of services to preschool-aged children, as set forth in their IEPs/IFSPs; and (4) documentation that it has ensured the correction of the noncompliance related to the secondary transition requirements.

As noted above, the State did not, as required by the measurement for this indicator, report on the percent of findings made in 2004-2005 that were timely corrected in 2005-2006.

Maine has reviewed its 2004-2005 monitoring and due process data and updated the SPP with the data regarding findings identified in 2004-2005 that were corrected within twelve (12) months. The resulting data are shown below.

23 LEAs monitored in FFY2004	FFY2004 (July 2004 - June 2005)		
	findings	areas checked	compliant
Indicator 11 Findings	9	23	14
Indicator 13 Findings	14	23	9

Item (1): Twenty-three (23) findings were addressed in 2004-2005 as a result of focused monitoring. Of the twenty-three (23) 14 school units demonstrated correction within twelve (12) months as required, 5 demonstrated correction within 13 months and 4 received State imposed Sanctions. The data required of the LEA was to submit a Corrective Action Plan detailing their steps for correction along with submission of documents from new referrals showing compliance delivered to the program review office and all LEA data were reviewed by the program review specialist assigned to the LEA. Approval of each corrective action and the supporting data were given in writing once the non-compliance was corrected.

Sixteen (16) due process corrective actions were initiated by case activity in FFY 2004. Fifteen (15) were closed in less than one year. The one case that did not get resolved within the twelve month timeline was pursued actively by the Due Process Office. The LEA received from the Due Process Office detailed, written technical assistance concerning the need to provide required documentation and specific instructions regarding the content.

Baseline data for FFY2004 (2004-2005):

Percent = [(number of finding resolved within twelve months) divided by (the number of findings)] times 100 = $32 \div 33 = 97\%$

Item (2): Twenty-two (22) of the twenty-four (24) state approved special purpose private schools were fully approved in 2005. Each of the twenty-four (24) had findings; twenty-two (22) were fully corrected in 2005. The two special purpose private schools that did not timely correct all compliance within 12 months of findings have been put under special sanctions and are now only provisionally approved pending correction of identified issues. Both have a timeline for correction for which the department will revoke school approval if deadlines are not met.

Items (3 and 4): The Twenty-three (23) findings above are the result of non-compliance in two areas of the focused monitoring compliance measurement: nine (9) of the findings were the result of noncompliance regarding the provision of services to pre-school-aged and school-aged children; fourteen (14) were the result of noncompliance related to the secondary transition requirements. Documentation of the actions taken, issues resolve and evidence of compliance were managed by the focused monitoring Program Review Office and each correction was completed ~~within timelines~~ as mentioned above.

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600. In its response to Indicator 15 in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must disaggregate by APR indicator the status of timely correction of the noncompliance findings identified by the State during FFY 2005 (2005-2006). In addition, the State must, in responding to Indicators 4A, 9, 10, 11, and 13, specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.

Data details documented by OSEP regarding Indicators 4A, 9, 10, 11, and 13 are addressed in the narrative responses to the OSEP June 15, 2007 Response Letter entries in each of the noted indicators in this submission of the APR.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.
= [(3 + 12) ÷ 15] times 100 = 100

SECTION A: Signed, written complaints (extracted from Table 7 for FFY2006)	
(1) Signed, written complaints total	59
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	15
(a) Reports with findings	9
(b) Reports within timeline	3
(c) Reports within extended timelines	12
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	44
(1.3) Complaints pending	0
(a) Complaint pending a due process hearing	0

FFY 2006	Measurable and Rigorous Target
	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
FFY 2006	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

100% timeline compliance represents significant progress from the 81.3% reported last year, and achievement of the 100% required compliance. Although the performance is complying with the requirements of the indicator, a substantial number of the cases were closed within extended timelines. The Due Process Office (DPO) has reviewed each instance for the reason for extensions in order to formulate appropriate improvement activities if necessary. During that process, all resolved cases were reviewed to determine if patterns of cause or systemic influences were apparent. Data indicate a tendency to exceed the timeline and frequent incidences of extensions being granted. DPO pursued the following questions (*responses/conclusions in italics*):

Should we establish a process for assuring consideration of extension at an appropriate interval?

Yes, we should automatically indicate an extension for complaint investigations in which the parties agree to participate in mediation. It would be advisable for the investigators to indicate in the complaint investigation report draft when a mediation has been held & has caused an extension of the complaint investigation. Furthermore, we need to make sure that the complaint investigators indicate in Section III of the complaint investigation report draft when any extension has been requested and granted or when any exceptional circumstance has arisen that has prolonged the investigation.

Why did three cases complete within timelines and why were extensions granted for them?

Generally, extensions are granted for a wide variety of reasons, such as: family emergencies; previous plans made by families or SAU's; snowstorms; difficulty for the complaint investigator to contact interviewees. In the cases listed below, extensions were granted but, nonetheless, the investigators met the 60-day timelines for the complaint investigation reports.

In 07.067C, an extension was granted for the date of the complaint investigation meeting (CIM) & later the CIM was cancelled.

In 07.093, an extension was granted for the documents due date due to a storm & school closing.

In 07.108C, an extension was granted for the documents due date and the complaint investigation was about a simple issue.

What were the reasons for twelve of the cases to be completed within extended timelines, what causes them to be extended, and how might they have been completed within timelines?

In 07.075C, the investigation involved a child with many severe disabilities and a long, complex educational history. Interviews had to be conducted with people from Perkins School for the Blind among many others. The investigators had to peruse and analyze at least 600 pages of documents total from both parties. In addition to this child, there were two other complaint investigations (cases 07.080C and 07.092C) about two other children from the same family. The DPO chose to appoint the same investigators (one of whom was being trained by the only veteran investigator) to investigate all three cases to avoid repetition. The complexity of 075C and the appointment of the same investigators to the cases pertaining to two of the child's other siblings prolonged the issuance of the complaint investigation reports for cases 07.080 and 07.092.

In 07.009C, the investigators (one of whom was being trained by the only veteran investigator) encountered barriers from the LEA in gaining access and making contact with interviewees.

In 07.083C, the investigator had great difficulty in making contact with the family and tried unsuccessfully to obtain permission to interview and receive documents from key sources.

In 07.076C, the LEA requested a dismissal of the entire complaint investigation and the regulatory clock stopped ticking for that case until the Commissioner reviewed both parties' stances and made her decision to decline the request for dismissal.

In 07.119C, 07.092 the LEA's attorney requested and was granted an extension of the docs due date.

In 07.085C, the LEA requested & was granted an extension of the CIM date.

In 07.021C, 07.080C, 07.085 the complaint investigator requested and was granted an extension of the CIM date.

In 07.078C & 07.110C, parties were granted extension when the parties agreed to participate in mediation.

Analysis of the details in each case was helpful in identifying the reasons for extension. The extensions were granted consistent with the state regulations and guidelines for complaint investigations. The extensions did not inappropriately delay provision of FAPE or create a hardship on the parties, while the additional time provided the opportunity for parties to address all issues in the cases and complete investigations with high quality documentation.

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR data demonstrating compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.661(a) and (b) (now 34 CFR §300.152(a) and (b)).

The data that the State reported for this indicator in the FFY 2005 APR and in Table 7 were inconsistent with each other and unclear. In the Explanation of Progress or Slippage, the State reported that 49 complaints were "processed" during the reporting period, with 19 resulting in reports being issued. In Table 7, the State did not report the total number of written, signed complaints, and reported that there were 49 complaints with reports issued, 19 reports with findings, 13 complaints withdrawn or dismissed, and 30 complaints pending. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must provide data that are consistent with the data in Table 7.

Clarification of FFY 2005 data: Table 7 entries of complaints for FFY 2005 were entered into the wrong rows (shifted down one row) of the table. The number of written, signed complaint issued in FFY 2005 was 49. Of those, 19 had reports issued, 13 reports with findings, 30 complaints withdrawn or dismissed, and 0 complaints pending.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.152.

Revision/justification to Improvement Activities: Improvement activities for this indicator were reviewed and modified to sustain compliance to this indicator. Modified activity: DPO finalized an internal list of extenuating circumstances distributed to complaint investigators as guidance for the joint (with DPO) consideration of requests for extensions. DPO continues training and technical assistance associated with extenuating circumstances into FFY2007 to reinforce an adoption of the guidelines. Added: DPO continue to review data on complaint investigations to monitor closure timeliness and ensure consideration of support required. The revised table is included below:

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
DPO finalized an internal list of “extenuating circumstances” distributed to complaint investigators as guidance for the joint (with DPO) consideration of requests for extensions.	X	X	X				
Review data on complaint investigations to monitor closure timeliness and ensure consideration of support required.		X	X	X	X	X	DPO

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.
= [0 + 6] ÷ 6] times 100 = 100

SECTION C: Hearing requests (extracted from Table 7 for FFY2006)	
(3) Hearing requests total	37
(3.1) Resolution sessions	2
(a) Settlement agreements	1
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	6
(a) Decisions within timeline	0
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	6
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	30

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
FFY 2006	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

This measure met the target.

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: OSEP’s March 13, 2006 FFY 2004 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR data demonstrating compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.511 (now 34 CFR §300.515 (a)).

OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance and looks forward to data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that continue to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.515(a).

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: The State’s SPP includes improvement activities only for FFY 2005, and does not include activities to maintain compliance under this indicator for FFY 2006-2010. The State must include maintenance and/or improvement activities for FFY 2006 through FFY 2010 in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.

Revision/justification to Improvement Activities: An improvement activity was added to the SPP to review data on mediations to monitor rates of agreement. A number of improvement activities that were completed in FFY2005 were removed from the table. The revised table is included below:

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
Review data on hearings to monitor and ensure timeline compliance		X	X	X	X	X	DPO

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: 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))

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.
= (1 ÷ 2) times 100 = 50

SECTION C: Hearing requests (extracted from Table 7 for FFY2006)	
(3) Hearing requests total	37
(3.1) Resolution sessions	2
(a) Settlement agreements	1
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	6
(a) Decisions within timeline	0
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	6
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	30

<i>FFY 2006</i>	Measurable and Rigorous Target
	30% of resolution sessions will result in settlement agreements
<i>FFY 2006</i>	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
	50% of resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities under this indicator, and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.

Performance exceeded the target.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

Maine

Revision/justification to Improvement Activities: Improvement activities “Informational Letter # 12 sent to all LEAs – August 15, 2005” and “Collection of resolution session data in DPO database” were implemented in FFY2005 so they were removed from the Improvement Activities table.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.
= [(7 + 37) ÷ 52] times 100 = 85

SECTION B: Mediation requests (extracted from Table 7 for FFY2006)	
(2) Mediation requests total	122
(2.1) Mediations (held)	52
(a) Mediations related to due process	9
(i) Mediation agreements	7
(b) Mediations not related to due process	43
(i) Mediation agreements	37
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	70

FFY 2006	Measurable and Rigorous Target
	77% of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.
FFY 2006	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
	85% of mediations held resulted in mediation agreements.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

Maine met its FFY2006 target and can foresee no mitigating factors that would likely raise concerns in meeting future targets.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

Revision/justification to Improvement Activities: In FFY2005, the DPO changed the DOCKET designation of stand-alone mediations to "S" so as to differentiate them from mediations associated

with complaint investigations, hearings and expedited hearings. That Improvement activity has been removed from the Improvement Activity table. The revised table is included below:

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
<p>With the advent of the resolution session for hearings initiated by parents, the DPO mediation process has been put in a deferential position vis-à-vis the resolution session timeframe. If both parties agree to participate in mediation within the timelines of a hearing requested by a family, the DPO sets up the mediation to occur on or after the 21st day from the receipt of the request for hearing. As in resolution sessions, mediations are a voluntary process and there's very little that the DPO can do, other than contact the initiating party about the benefits of participation in mediation to ensure that parties participate in mediation. Keeping this in mind, it is difficult to set a percentage goal for mediation agreements when so much of the process is out of the control of the SEA.</p>	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>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, the difference between mediation and a PET meeting, the expertise and objectivity of the mediator and the wide scope of issues in hopes that the person will choose to participate in mediation.</p>
<p>Review of the indicator by the stakeholder group highlighted the opportunity to improve mediation outcomes by establishing standards for advocates. Additional evaluation will be done of advocate relationships to mediation outcomes to determine the most effective strategies for defining standards.</p>		X	X				

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

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

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates ; and
- b. Accurate

Percent determined using the Data Scoring Rubric (included below) = 95

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2006</i>	100% of data submitted will be on time and accurate.
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
<i>FFY 2006</i>	95% of data submitted will be on time and accurate.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: Although the State reported 100% compliance for this indicator, the State did not report valid and reliable data for Indicators 1, 2, 3A, 7, 12, and 15.

The State must review its improvement strategies and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure that they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in IDEA section 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).

The calculation of this indicator is described in the State Performance Plan (SPP) as [(number submitted on time and accurate) ÷ (number required to be submitted)] times 100. However, Maine used the Data Scoring Rubric for Part B – Indicator 20 to compile the data for this calculation; the table from the worksheet is inserted below. The data used in the scoring rubric are related to the quality of the FFY2006 APR submitted February 1, 2008 and the quality of the 618 data submissions for FFY2006 (tables submitted February 1, 2007 and November 1, 2007).

The resulting indicator score for indicator 20 is 98.3% for FFY2006.

OSEP's June 15, 2007 response letter provided specific feedback regarding data validity and reliability, correct calculations, and following instructions that were used to population the scoring rubric. The FFY2006 indicators for 1, 2, 3A, 7, 12, and 15 presented in this APR specifically address the data validity and reliability issues that were present in the FFY2005 data submission. The data provided in this FFY2006 submission were drawn as directly as possible (analysis was required in some cases) from the collection databases and compared with the EDEN electronic submission, Part B data collection tables submitted to Westat, and paper submissions to ensure comparability and accuracy across all data provided.

SPP/APR Data - Indicator 20				
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Correct Calculation	Followed Instructions	Total
1	1		1	2
2	1		1	2
3A	1	1	1	3
3B	1	1	1	3
3C	1	1	1	3
4A	1	1	1	3
5	1	1	1	3
7	1	1	1	3
8	1	1	1	3
9	1	1	1	3
10	1	1	1	3
11	1	1	1	3
12	1	1	1	3
13	1	1	1	3
14	1	1	1	3
15	1	1	1	3
16	1	1	1	3
17	1	1	1	3
18	1	1	1	3
19	1	1	1	3
			Subtotal	58
APR Score Calculation		Timely Submission Points - If the FFY2006 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.		5
		Grand Total - (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =		63

Maine submitted its complete and accurate 618 data on time, and responded promptly to the data note requests for all tables with one exception. The Table 5 submission for discipline data required follow-up exception because some data elements could not be provided so the data complete column in the rubric was marked 0 for Table 5. Table 5 missing data has been corrected by moving the collection to the statewide student information system. [Administrative Letter 24](#) established a

Maine

verification mechanism to ensure data completeness and accuracy so that the FFY2007 data will possess all required elements.

618 Data - Indicator 20					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Table 1 - Child Count Due Date: 2/1/07	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 - Personnel Due Date: 11/1/07	1	1	0	1	3
Table 3 - Ed. Environments Due Date: 2/1/07	1	1	1	1	4
Table 4 - Exiting Due Date: 11/1/07	1	1	1	1	4
Table 5 - Discipline Due Date: 11/1/07	1	0	1	1	3
Table 6 - State Assessment Due Date: 2/1/07	1	1	0	1	3
Table 7 - Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/07	1	1	1	1	4
				Subtotal	25
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 2) =		50

Indicator #20 Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	63
B. 618 Grand Total	50
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	113
Total N/A in APR	0
Total N/A in 618	0
Base	119
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*) =	0.950
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	95.0

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

Revision/justification to Improvement Activities: Improvement strategies for the indicators that possessed data validity or reliability issues were reviewed and modified as appropriate to improve data collection, analysis, reporting and verification.

FFY2006 Part B Annual Performance Report Appendix

Indicator Reference	Title/Description	Number of Pages
3	Participation and Performance of Students with Disabilities on state Assessments – DTS for Table 6	20
8	Parent Survey – Part B 619	2
8	Parent Survey – Part B school aged	2
14	Follow-Up Maine Graduate Survey: Graduates of High School Special Education Programs	23
16-19	TABLE 7 REPORT OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION UNDER PART B, OF THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT 2006-07	1

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE ASSESSMENTS

DATE: February 1, 2008

STATUS: ORIGINAL SUBMISSION

Data are due February 1, 2008.

Please read the following basic guidelines before completing the Data Transmission System (DTS) forms:

1. To change the size and appearance of the text on the spreadsheet, select VIEW from the toolbar, select ZOOM, and then select the percentage increase or decrease.
2. Enter the appropriate data into the YELLOW shaded areas on each page of the form. Please be sure to read section heading descriptions so data are entered in the correct section. Also, be sure to enter any State and date information. The two-digit State postal code should appear on every page of the form. A list is available on PAGE1. Use the scroll bar or the up or down arrow keys to scroll through the list. Click on the appropriate State postal code to select it.
3. If you choose to cut and paste data from another area, use the PASTE SPECIAL option and select VALUES. This will protect the current formats.
4. Any comments regarding the submitted data should be entered on the last page of the workbook, titled COMMENTS.
5. Save the completed forms. Please be sure that your State postal code appears in the file name. (Example: Maryland - AS06MD.XLS)
6. Red cells indicate a condition that must hold. Orange cells indicate a condition that should hold. **Please make sure there are NO RED CELLS before saving and submitting data.**
7. Print the entire workbook by selecting, FILE, PRINT and then select ENTIRE WORKBOOK located in the 'PRINT WHAT' section. Send printed copies of the completed DTS forms to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) at the following address:

Patricia J. Guard, Acting Director
Office of Special Education Programs
U.S. Department of Education
Part B Data Reports
Program Support Services Group
Mail Stop 2600
550 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

8. If you received your file by e-mail, please return electronic copies of completed DTS forms to Westat.

IDEAData_PartB@WESTAT.COM
Westat
1650 Research Blvd.
RA 1203
Rockville, MD 20850-3159

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Mary Job at (301) 315-5939.

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2006-2007

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION A. ENROLLMENT DATA FOR THE MATH ASSESSMENT¹

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH IEPs (1)	ALL STUDENTS (2)
3	2495	14095
4	2592	14180
5	2567	14332
6	2610	14620
7	2561	15229
8	2683	15800
HIGH SCHOOL (SPECIFY GRADE:) 11	2352	16094

¹At a date as close as possible to the testing date.

2006-2007

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION B. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS			
	TOTAL (3)	SUBSET (OF 3) WHO TOOK THE ASSESSMENT WITH ACCOMODATIONS (3A)	LEP STUDENTS IN US < 12 MONTHS WHOSE ENGLISH PROFICIENCY TEST REPLACED REGULAR READING ASSESSMENT (3B) ¹	SUBSET (OF 3) WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ² (3C)
3	2312	1675		0
4	2396	1947		0
5	2346	1923		0
6	2368	1870		0
7	2292	1838		0
8	2351	1866		0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	1991	1126		0

¹ This column is gray because it does not apply to the math assessment. Do not enter data in this column.

² Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problems in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of the assessment, students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly) or changes in testing materials that resulted in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students who took the assessment assessment without these changes.

CURRENT DATE:

2006-2007

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION B. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT				
	TOTAL (4)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE WAS SCORED AGAINST GRADE LEVEL STANDARDS (4A)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE WAS SCORED AGAINST ALTERNATE ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4B)	SUBSET (OF 4B) COUNTED AT THE LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL BECAUSE OF THE NCLB CAP ¹ (4C)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ² (4D)
3	160	0	160	0	0
4	166	0	166	0	0
5	199	0	199	0	0
6	192	0	192	0	0
7	209	0	209	0	0
8	240	0	240	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL :	11				
	179	0	179	0	0

¹ NCLB 1% cap is the limit on the number of **scores on an alternate assessment on alternate achievement standards that can be counted as proficient** AYP calculations. If in 2006-07 your state had an approved exception to the 1% cap as indicated in Section A, use your 2006-07 adjusted cap rather than 1% when determining the number of students that must be counted in the lowest achievement level.

² Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problems in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of the assessment or students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly) **or changes in testing materials that resulted in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students who took the assessment without these changes.**

2006-2007

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION B. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE AN ASSESSMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH NCLB

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WHO TOOK AN OUT OF LEVEL TEST (5)	STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE ANY ASSESSMENT		
		PARENTAL EXEMPTION (6)	ABSENT (7)	EXEMPT FOR OTHER REASONS ⁵ (8)
3	0	0	18	5
4	0	0	21	9
5	0	0	12	10
6	0	0	34	16
7	0	0	42	18
8	0	0	72	20
HIGH SCHOOL :	11	0	171	11

¹ In a separate listing, report the number of students exempted for other reasons by grade and specific reason.

Please provide the reason(s) for exemption.

2006-2007

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT

REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL (9A)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Does Not Meet	Partially Meets	Meets	Exceeds						9A ROW TOTAL ¹
		Achievement Level									
3	MEA	492	905	785	130	0	0	0	0	0	2312
4	MEA	723	809	808	56	0	0	0	0	0	2396
5	MEA	778	854	642	72	0	0	0	0	0	2346
6	MEA	1113	763	428	64	0	0	0	0	0	2368
7	MEA	1285	628	320	59	0	0	0	0	0	2292
8	MEA	1430	544	344	33	0	0	0	0	0	2351
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	SAT	1500	361	127	3	0	0	0	0	0	1991

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: Meets

¹ The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9A is to equal the number reported in column 3 minus the number reported in columns 3B and 3C.

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 09/30/2007

STATE: ME - MAINE

2006-2007

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL STANDARDS (9B)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Attempting	Emerging	Meeting	Exceeding						9B ROW TOTAL ¹
		Achievement Level									
3	PAAP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	PAAP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	PAAP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	PAAP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	PAAP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	PAAP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	PAAP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: Meeting

¹ The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9B is equal to the number reported in Column 4A minus that portion of 4D that refers to invalid results from assessments scored against grade level achievement standards.

CURRENT DATE:

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2006-2007

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT SCORED AGAINST ALTERNATE STANDARDS (9C)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Attempting	Emerging	Meeting	Exceeding						9C ROW TOTAL ²
		Achievement Level ¹	Achievement Level								
3	PAAP	8	54	43	55	0	0	0	0	0	160
4	PAAP	4	49	33	80	0	0	0	0	0	166
5	PAAP	15	67	54	63	0	0	0	0	0	199
6	PAAP	10	63	43	76	0	0	0	0	0	192
7	PAAP	22	62	38	87	0	0	0	0	0	209
8	PAAP	27	60	42	111	0	0	0	0	0	240
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	PAAP	16	41	28	94	0	0	0	0	0	179

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: Meeting

¹ Include all students whose assessment counted in the lowest achievement level because of the NCLB 1% cap.

² The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9C is to equal the number reported in column 4B minus that portion of 4D that refers to invalid results from assessments scored against alternate achievement standards.

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2006-2007

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9A (ON PAGE 6) ¹	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9B (ON PAGE 7) ¹	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9C (ON PAGE 8) ¹	NO VALID SCORE ^{1, 2} (10)	TOTAL ^{1, 3} (11)
3	2312	0	160	23	2495
4	2396	0	166	30	2592
5	2346	0	199	22	2567
6	2368	0	192	50	2610
7	2292	0	209	60	2561
8	2351	0	240	92	2683
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	1991	0	179	182	2352

¹ STATES SHOULD NOT REPORT DATA ON THIS PAGE. THESE DATA WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE REPORTED DATA AFTER THE COUNTS ARE SUBMITTED. PLEASE REVIEW FOR ERRORS.

² Column 10 is calculated by summing the numbers reported in column 3C plus column 4D plus column 5 plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8.

³ Column 11 should equal the number of students with IEPs reported in column 1 of Section A. If the number of students is not the same, provide an explanation. Column 11 should always equal the sum of the number of students reported in columns 3 plus column 4 plus column 5 plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8.

Explanation

CURRENT DATE:

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2006-2007

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION D. ENROLLMENT DATA FOR THE READING ASSESSMENT¹

GRADE LEVEL		STUDENTS WITH IEPs (1)	ALL STUDENTS (2)
3		2495	14095
4		2593	14180
5		2567	14332
6		2610	14620
7		2561	15229
8		2683	15800
HIGH SCHOOL (SPECIFY GRADE:)	11	2352	16094

¹At a date as close as possible to the testing date.

2006-2007

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS			
	TOTAL (3)	SUBSET (OF 3) WHO TOOK THE ASSESSMENT WITH ACCOMODATIONS (3A)	LEP STUDENTS IN US < 12 MONTHS WHOSE ENGLISH PROFICIENCY TEST REPLACED REGULAR READING ASSESSMENT (3B) ¹	SUBSET (OF 3) WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ² (3C)
3	2307	1694	0	0
4	2381	1941	0	0
5	2332	1918	0	0
6	2360	1882	0	0
7	2296	1867	0	0
8	2353	1872	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	1870	1127	0	0

¹ Report those LEP students who, at the time of the reading assessment, were in the United States for less than 12 months and took the English proficiency test in place of the regular reading assessment.

² Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problems in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of the assessment or students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly) or changes in testing materials that resulted in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students who took the assessment without these changes.

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2006-2007

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT				
	TOTAL (4)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE WAS SCORED AGAINST GRADE LEVEL STANDARDS (4A)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE WAS SCORED AGAINST ALTERNATIVE ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4B)	SUBSET (OF 4B) COUNTED AT THE LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL BECAUSE OF THE NCLB 1% CAP ¹ (4C)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ² (4D)
3	168	0	168	0	0
4	180	0	180	0	0
5	213	0	213	0	0
6	198	0	198	0	0
7	209	0	209	0	0
8	239	0	239	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	178	0	178	0	0

¹ NCLB 1% cap is the limit on the number of **scores on an alternate assessment on alternate achievement standards that can be counted as proficient** AYP calculations. If in 2006-07 your state had an approved exception to the 1% cap as indicated in Section A, use your 2006-07 adjusted cap rather than 1% when determining the number of students that must be counted in the lowest achievement level.

² Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problems in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of the assessment or students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly) **or changes in testing materials that resulted in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students who took the assessment without these changes.**

2006-2007

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE AN ASSESSMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH NCLB			
	STUDENTS WHO TOOK AN OUT OF LEVEL TEST (5)	STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE ANY ASSESSMENT		
		PARENTAL EXEMPTION (6)	ABSENT (7)	EXEMPT FOR OTHER REASONS ⁵ (8)
3		0	15	5
4		0	22	10
5		0	12	10
6		0	36	16
7		0	39	17
8		0	70	21
HIGH SCHOOL :	11	0	293	11

¹ In a separate listing, report the number of students exempted for other reasons by grade and specific reason.

Please provide the reason(s) for exemption.

CURRENT DATE:

2006-2007

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT

REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL (9A)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Does Not Meet	Partially Meets	Meets	Exceeds						9A ROW TOTAL ¹
		Achievement Level									
3	MEA	477	1050	770	10	0	0	0	0	0	2307
4	MEA	591	974	803	13	0	0	0	0	0	2381
5	MEA	786	1008	528	10	0	0	0	0	0	2332
6	MEA	816	934	597	13	0	0	0	0	0	2360
7	MEA	896	774	572	54	0	0	0	0	0	2296
8	MEA	1031	867	427	28	0	0	0	0	0	2353
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	SAT	1175	488	189	18	0	0	0	0	0	1870

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: Meets

¹ The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9A is to equal the number reported in column 3 minus the number reported in columns 3B and 3C.

CURRENT DATE:

TABLE 6
 REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2006-2007

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL STANDARDS (9B)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Attempting	Emerging	Meeting	Exceeding						9B ROW TOTAL ¹
		Achievement Level									
3	PAAP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	PAAP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	PAAP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	PAAP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	PAAP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	PAAP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	PAAP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: Meeting

¹ The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9B is equal to the number reported in Column 4A minus that portion of 4D that refers to invalid results from assessments scored against grade level achievement s

CURRENT DATE:

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2006-2007

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT SCORED AGAINST ALTERNATE STANDARDS (9C)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Attempting	Emerging	Meeting	Exceeding						9C ROW TOTAL ²
		Achievement Level ¹	Achievement Level								
3	PAAP	1	59	85	23	0	0	0	0	0	168
4	PAAP	4	57	77	42	0	0	0	0	0	180
5	PAAP	11	56	90	56	0	0	0	0	0	213
6	PAAP	4	46	83	65	0	0	0	0	0	198
7	PAAP	21	74	76	38	0	0	0	0	0	209
8	PAAP	24	80	67	68	0	0	0	0	0	239
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	PAAP	22	58	59	39	0	0	0	0	0	178

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: Meeting

¹ Include all students whose assessment counted in the lowest achievement level because of the NCLB 1% cap.

² The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9C is to equal the number reported in column 4B minus that portion of 4D that refers to invalid results from assessments scored against alternate achievement standards.

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2006-2007

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9A (ON PAGE 15)	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9B (ON PAGE 16)	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9C (ON PAGE 17)	NO VALID SCORE ² (10)	TOTAL ³ (11)
3	2307	0	168	20	2495
4	2381	0	180	32	2593
5	2332	0	213	22	2567
6	2360	0	198	52	2610
7	2296	0	209	56	2561
8	2353	0	239	91	2683
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	1870	0	178	304	2352

¹ STATES SHOULD NOT REPORT DATA ON THIS PAGE. THESE DATA WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE REPORTED DATA AFTER THE COUNTS ARE SUBMITTED. PLEASE REVIEW FOR ERRORS.

² Column 10 is calculated by summing the numbers reported in column 3B plus column 3C plus column 4D plus column 5 plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8.

³ Column 11 should equal the number of students with IEPs reported in column 1 of Section A. If the number of students is not the same, provide an explanation. Column 11 should always equal the sum of the number of students reported in columns 3 plus column 4 plus column 5 plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8.

CURRENT DATE:

This survey is for parents whose **child or children are between ages 3 and 5** and are getting early intervention services through Child Development Services. This survey is important to you and your child in Maine because your answers will help improve services for children and families.

If you would like help completing the survey, please provide your phone number. Someone from the Maine Parent Federation will contact you.

Phone number _____

Directions: For each statement below, please select one of the following choices: **Never, Rarely, Often, Always**, as you recall your past experiences. You may skip any item you feel does not apply to you or your child.

	Never	Rarely	Often	Always
1. I was offered the help I needed so I could participate in Early Childhood Team (ECT) meetings and in the development of the Individualized Family Service Program(IFSP).				
2. My concerns and recommendations were considered in the development of the IFSP.				
3. I have been asked for my opinion about how well early intervention services are meeting my child's needs.				
4. Any written information I receive is written or explained to me in a way I understand.				
5. CDS staff treat me as a team member.				
6. Those involved in my child's ECT meetings seek out my input.				
7. I received a copy of my rights and was told who to call if I didn't understand something.				
8. I know who to call with questions regarding my child's early intervention.				
9. The CDS site communicates with me regarding my child's progress on IFSP goals.				
10. The CDS site offers me training about early intervention issues.				
11. The CDS site helps me to play an active role in my child's early intervention.				
12. The CDS site explains what options I have if I disagree with a decision.				
13. I feel welcome by administration and staff from the CDS site.				
14. CDS staff have helped me get the services that my child needs.				
15. CDS staff have helped me communicate more effectively with the people who work with my child.				

Please complete the other side

(over)

16. CDS staff have helped me know about my child's and my rights concerning special education services.				
17. My input regarding the transition needs that focus on my child's transition-to-school goals are considered in the development of the IEP.				
18. The CDS site assists me in understanding what outside agencies can assist my child in realizing his/her education goals.				

19. What your current involvement with Early Intervention Services.
- a. ___ My child has only been referred for services.
 - b. ___ My child has been determined eligible for services.
 - c. ___ We are currently waiting for services to begin.
 - d. ___ We have been receiving services.
20. How old was your child at the time you completed this survey?
- a. ___ 3 years old b. ___ 4 years old c. ___ 5 years old d. ___ older than 5
21. What grade is your child in, if any? _____
22. Is your child a male or female?
- a. ___ Male b. ___ Female
23. How old was your child when he or she was first referred to Special Education?
- a. ___ Birth - 2 b. ___ 3 - 5
24. What is your child's race / ethnicity
- a. ___ White b. ___ African-American c. ___ Hispanic
 - d. ___ Asian or Pacific Islander e. ___ American Indian/Alaskan Native
25. What is your relationship to the child?
- a. ___ Mother b. ___ Father c. ___ Guardian
 - d. ___ Surrogate Parent e. ___ Foster Parent f. ___ Grandparent

Thank you very much. Please return the survey as soon as possible. Your answers will be combined with others who completed this survey and kept in the strictest confidence.

The results will be posted on the Maine Department of Education website
<http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/cds/index.htm>

This survey is for parents whose **child or children are 5 or older** and are getting special education services. This survey is important to you and your child in Maine because your answers will help improve services for children and families.

If you would like help completing the survey, please provide your phone number. Someone from the Maine Parent Federation will contact you.

Phone number _____

Directions: For each statement below, please select one of the following choices: **Never, Rarely, Often, Always**, as you recall your past experiences. You may skip any item you feel does not apply to you or your child.

	Never	Rarely	Often	Always
1. I was offered the help I needed so I could participate in Pupil Evaluation Team (PET) meetings and in the development of my child's Individualized Educational Program (IEP).				
2. My concerns and recommendations are considered in the development of the IEP.				
3. I have been asked for my opinion about how well special education services are meeting my child's needs.				
4. Any information I receive is written or explained to me in a way I understand.				
5. Teachers treat me as a team member.				
6. Those involved in my child's PET meetings seek out my input.				
7. I received a copy of my rights and was told who to call if I didn't understand something.				
8. I know who to call with questions regarding my child's special education.				
9. The school communicates with me regarding my child's progress on IEP goals.				
10. The school offers me training about special education issues.				
11. The school helps me to play an active role in my child's education.				
12. The school explains what options I have if I disagree with a decision.				
13. I feel welcome by administration and staff from the school.				
14. Special education staff have helped me get the educational services my child needs.				
15. Special education staff have helped me communicate more effectively with the people who work with my child.				

Please complete the other side

(over)

16. Special education staff have helped me know about my child's and my rights concerning special education services.				
17. For my 14 to 20 year old, my input is considered in the development of the IEP that focuses on my child's goals after high school.				
18. For my 14 to 20 year old, the school helps me understand which outside agencies can help my child reach his/her after high school goals.				

19. How old was your child at the time you completed this survey?

- a. 5-11 b. 12-17 c. 18-20

20. Where does your child attend school? _____

21. What grade is your child in? _____

22. Is your child a male or female?

- a. Male b. Female

23. How old was your child when he or she was first identified as a student with special education needs?

- a. Birth - 2 b. 3 - 5 c. 6 - 11 d. 12 - 17

24. What is your child's race / ethnicity

- a. White b. African-American c. Hispanic
d. Asian or Pacific Islander e. American Indian/Alaskan Native

25. What is your relationship to the child?

- a. Mother b. Father c. Guardian
d. Surrogate Parent e. Foster Parent f. Grandparent

Thank you very much. Please return the survey as soon as possible. Your answers will be combined with others who completed this survey and kept in the strictest confidence.

**The results will be posted on the Maine Department of Education website
<http://www.state.me.us/education/homepage.htm>**



I D E A

Targeted Needs

Final Report to
U.S. Office of Special Education Programs
Grant #PL 105-17

Prepared for:
GEM School Software
Box 623
West Kennebunk, ME 04904

Prepared by:
Walter G. McIntire, Ph.D.
56 Eustis Parkway
Waterville, ME 04901

November 2006



**Follow-Up Maine Graduate Survey:
Graduates of High School Special Education Programs**

*A Report to:
U.S. Office of Special Education Programs
November 2006*

*Walter G. McIntire, PH.D.
56 Eustis Parkway
Waterville, ME 04901*

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	1
II. How Do Respondents Compare to the Target Population?	1
Table 1. Population Comparison: Means of Exiting High School Special Education Program	1
Table 2. Population Comparison: Respondent Special Education Placement	2
Table 3. Population Comparison: Respondent Reported Disability	2
III. Characteristics of the Surveyed Population	2
Means of Program Exit	2
Table 4. Respondent Means of Exiting High School Special Education Program	3
Program Placement	3
Table 5. Respondent Special Education Placement	3
Table 6. Means of Exit Based on Placement	4
Disability	4
Table 7. Respondent Reported Disability	4
Table 8. Respondent Means of Exit Based on Respondent Disability	5
Table 9. Respondent Means of Exit Based on Placement	5
IV. The Survey	6
IEP/PET Happenings	6
Table 10. Do you actively participate in transition planning?	6
Table 11. Did you lead/facilitate your IEP/PET meeting?	6
Table 12. Were steps taken to ensure that your preferences and interests were taken into consideration in the IEP/PET discussions?	6
Effectiveness of Classwork	6
Other Activities During Academic Year	7
Table 13. Did you participate in extracurricular activities while in high school?	7
Table 14. Did you have a paying job while you attended high school?	7
Table 15. Number of hours worked per week while attending high school.	8
Plans to Reality	8
Table 16. Before exiting high school what did you plan to do?	8
Table 17. Are you in school now?	9
Table 18. What type of school or program do you currently attend?	9
Table 19. Since leaving high school, have you had additional training or coursework?	9

Job Status	9
Table 20. Respondent Reasons for Unemployment	10
Table 21. Which of these occupations comes closest to what you are currently doing for work?	10
Table 22. Salary	11
Table 23. Do you receive any benefits with this job?	11
Dreaming of a Better Life	11
Table 24. What is the main thing you would add or change that would make your work life better?	11
Table 25. What is the main thing you would add or change that would make your life better?	12
V. Limitations	12
VI. Summary	12
How Do Respondents Compare to the Target Population?	12
Characteristics of the Surveyed Population	12
The Survey	13
Appendix A. Survey Responses Based on Respondent Means of Program Exit	14
Appendix B. Survey Responses Based on Respondent Disability	16
Appendix C. Survey Responses Based on Special Education Placement	18

**Follow-Up Maine Graduate Survey:
Graduates of High School Special Education Programs**

*U.S. Office of Special Education Programs
November 2006*

I. Introduction

U.S. Office of Special Education, under the guidance of Walter McIntire, Ph.D., created and administered a survey for the purpose of gaining information concerning individuals who exited Maine high school special education programs in the spring of 2005. The survey was conducted one year after the target population exited their program of study.

In 2005, 2,097 students exited high school special education programs throughout the state of Maine. Approximately one year later, each of these students was mailed a postcard requesting that he or she either login to complete a survey online or call the number provided and answer the questions over the phone. With only 11% ($n = 228$) of the postcards returned as undeliverable, it can be assumed that nearly 90% ($n = 1,869$) of all postcards reached homes of the graduates. A second mailing was conducted for students who had not responded to

the first postcard or for who no phone number listed. Of these slightly more than 500 postcards sent, 4% ($n = 20$) were returned as undeliverable. Students who did not complete the online version of the survey were contacted via telephone and asked to participate by completing the survey over the phone. By all attempted contacts, only 85 graduates were not reached by one effort or another.

A total of 626 students (30% of the total approached) were successfully contacted. Of these 626 students, nearly 500 completed the survey ($N = 497$, 24% of total approached). Fifty eight (12%) of these surveys were completed online. The remaining 433 (88%) were conducted over the telephone. One fifth ($n = 128$) of the students successfully contacted refused to complete the survey. An additional 9 students (1%) only partially completed the survey.

II. How Do Respondents Compare to the Target Population?

An analysis of target population and respondents reveals that the two groups are substantially similar in their distribution by school administrative unit (SAU). This was determined by comparing the statewide distribution of high school special education participants who completed their education in May of 2005 ($N = 2,097$) with the distribution of participants who completed the survey ($N = 497$). When the variables means of

program exit, special education placement, and disability were examined for each of the two groups, it only further strengthened the notion that these two populations are adequately similar. Therefore, it would be both appropriate and statistically justified to make assumptions about the entire target population based upon the information provided by the respondents here. (See Tables 1-3.)

Table 1. Population Comparison: Means of Exiting High School Special Education Program

	Respondents	Target Population
Graduated with Diploma	77%	71%
Dropped Out	16%	24%
Graduated through Certificate/Fulfillment of I.E.P. Requirement	6%	4%
Reached Maximum Age	1%	1%
Total	$N = 497$	$N = 2,097$

Table 2. Population Comparison: Respondent Special Education Placement

	Respondents	Target Population
Regular Class	52%	50%
Resource Room	24%	28%
Self-Contained	12%	12%
Private Separate Day School	3%	2%
Public Separate Day School	2%	1%
Homebound or Hospitalized	1%	1%
Residential Program	0%	< .05%
Total	<i>N</i> = 497	<i>N</i> = 2,097

Table 3. Population Comparison: Respondent Reported Disability

	Respondents	Target Population ^a
Learning Disability	42%	43%
Other Health Impairment	15%	15%
Multihandicapped	14%	11%
Emotional Disability	11%	13%
Speech and Language Impairment	7%	10%
Mental Retardation	5%	5%
Autism	3%	2%
Traumatic Brain Injury	1%	1%
Hearing Impairment	1%	1%
Visual Impairment	< .05%	< .05%
Deaf	< .05%	< .05%
Total	<i>N</i> = 497	<i>N</i> = 2,097

^aTarget population also included "orthopedic impairment," which represented < .05% of the total population.

III. Characteristics of the Surveyed Population

Means of Program Exit

Approximately three quarters (77%) of all respondents reported that they had graduated from their high school with a diploma. Another 6% stated they had graduated by obtaining a certificate or by fulfilling an I.E.P. requirement. Five students (1%) completed their program by reaching the maximum age limit and nearly one fifth (16%) had reportedly dropped out of school before completing

their program. Students whose status was unknown—had exited high school through regular education, moved out of district but were known to be continuing their education, were still receiving special education services, or were deceased—were not surveyed. (See Table 4 for complete results regarding respondent means of program exit.)

Table 4. Respondent Means of Exiting High School Special Education Program

	<i>n</i>	%
Graduated with Diploma	382	77%
Dropped Out	82	16%
Graduated through Certificate/Fulfillment of I.E.P. Requirement	28	6%
Reached Maximum Age	5	1%
Total	497	100%

Program Placement

Slightly more than half of all respondents (52%) reported having been placed in regular high school classrooms. With one quarter of respondents (24%) indicating that they had been placed in a resource room, that leaves less than a quarter for self-

contained, private/public separate day school, and homebound or hospitalized placements. (See Table 5 for complete results regarding special education placement.)

Table 5. Respondent Special Education Placement

	<i>n</i>	%
Regular Classroom	256	52%
Resource Room	120	24%
Self-Contained	60	12%
Private Separate Day School	16	3%
Public Separate Day School	9	2%
Homebound or Hospitalized	5	1%
Information not provided	31	6%
Total	497	100%

Over three quarters of all respondents who were placed in a regular classroom (83%) or resource room (81%) graduated with a diploma. The same was true for over half of respondents placed in a self-contained classroom (58%). However, these percentages dropped for those attending either public or private separate day schools, with less

than half of these respondents (44%) graduating with a diploma and nearly a quarter dropping out all together. Over half of all respondents who were either homebound or hospitalized during their high school education (60%) reported dropping out. (See Table 6 for a look at means of program exit based on program placement.)

Table 6. Means of Exit Based on Placement

	Graduated with Diploma	Dropped Out	Graduated through Certificate/Fulfillment of I.E.P. Requirement	Reached Maximum Age
Regular Classroom	83%	16%	0%	0%
Resource Room	81%	15%	4%	0%
Self-Contained	58%	18%	18%	5%
Private Separate Day School	44%	25%	25%	6%
Public Separate Day School	44%	22%	22%	11%
Homebound or Hospitalized	20%	60%	20%	0%

Disability

Nearly half of all respondents (42%) were involved in their high school special education program because of a learning disability. Thirty-nine percent were involved due to a health impairment, were multihandicapped, or harbored an emotional disability. (See Table 7.)

Regardless of disability type, most participants had successfully graduated from their high schools with a diploma. Respondents with an emotional disability, however, were more likely to have dropped out all together than those with other disabilities. (See Table 8.)

Most respondents who reported having a learning disability or impairment (health, hearing, speech/language, or visual) had been placed in regular classrooms. In contrast, more than half of respondents who reported being mental retarded or multihandicapped were not placed in regular classrooms and were either in a resource room or self-contained classroom. (See Table 9).

(See Tables 7-9 for complete results pertaining to respondent disability.)

Table 7. Respondent Reported Disability

	<i>n</i>	%
Learning Disability	207	42%
Other Health Impairment	75	15%
Multihandicapped	72	14%
Emotional Disability	57	11%
Speech and Language Impairment	35	7%
Mental Retardation	24	5%
Autism	15	3%
Traumatic Brain Injury	5	1%
Hearing Impairment	4	1%
Visual Impairment	2	<.05%
Deaf	1	<.05%
Total	<i>N</i> = 497	100%

Table 8. Respondent Means of Exit Based on Respondent Disability

	Graduated with Diploma	Dropped Out	Graduated through Certificate/Fulfill- ment of I.E.P. Requirement	Reached Maximum Age
Learning Disability	86%	13%	0%	0%
Other Health Impairment	71%	21%	8%	0%
Multihandicapped	64%	15%	17%	4%
Emotional Disability	54%	39%	5%	2%
Speech and Language Impairment	89%	9%	3%	0%
Mental Retardation	75%	13%	13%	0%
Autism	80%	0%	13%	7%
Traumatic Brain Injury	100%	0%	0%	0%
Hearing Impairment	100%	0%	0%	0%
Visual Impairment	100%	0%	0%	0%
Deaf	100%	0%	0%	0%

Table 9. Respondent Means of Exit Based on Placement

	Regular Classroom	Resource Room	Self - Contained	Private Separate Day School	Public Separate Day School	Homebound or Hospital
Learning Disability	69%	22%	1%	1%	0%	1%
Other Health Impairment	59%	20%	4%	3%	0%	1%
Multihandicapped	13%	39%	31%	11%	3%	0%
Emotional Disability	40%	25%	21%	7%	5%	0%
Speech and Language Impairment	60%	20%	9%	0%	0%	0%
Mental Retardation	4%	38%	42%	0%	4%	4%
Autism	40%	0%	47%	0%	0%	7%
Traumatic Brain Injury	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Hearing Impairment	75%	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%
Visual Impairment	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Deaf	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%

Note: Response percentages for those who did not provide information concerning their type of placement has not been included in this table. Therefore, percentages may not always add to 100%.

IV. The Survey

IEP/PET Procedures

Most students (68%) indicated that they were active participants when it came to transition planning. Although only about one eighth of all students (12%) stated that they lead or facilitated their IEP/PET meeting, most (83%) felt that their own

preferences and interests were taken into consideration during the resulting discussions. (See Tables 10-12 for complete results pertaining to IEP/PET sessions.)

Table 10. Did you actively participate in transition planning?

	<i>n</i>	%
Yes, during the IEP meeting	338	68%
Yes, outside of the IEP meeting	242	49%
No	87	17%

Table 11. Did you lead/facilitate your IEP/PET meeting?

	<i>n</i>	%
No	421	85%
Yes	58	12%
No response	18	4%
Total	<i>N</i> = 497	100%

Table 12. Were steps taken to ensure that your preferences and interests were taken into consideration in the IEP/PET discussions?

	<i>n</i>	%
Yes	414	83%
No	69	14%
No response	14	3%
Total	<i>N</i> = 497	100%

Effectiveness of Classwork

Respondents were split fairly evenly between those who attended career vocational technical schools (47%) and those who did not (51%). When asked to choose the one high school or technical school class

or program of extracurricular activity from each of several different categories which was most helpful in preparing themselves to find a job and to work, participant responses were as follows:

- ◆ Mainstream Academics: Mathematics (*n* = 14), English (*n* = 8), Science (*n* = 6), Social Studies (*n* = 3).
- ◆ Mainstream Other: Industrial Arts (*n* = 21), Computer Education (*n* = 10), Art (*n* = 5), Driver Education and Drafting/Mechanical Drawing (*n* = 2 each), Business Education, Living Arts, Physical Education, Peer Support Programs (*n* = 1 each).

- ◆ Special Education: Resource Room/Consulting Teacher Program ($n = 5$), Special Class Academics and Community Based Living Skills ($n = 2$ each), Speech/Language Therapy ($n = 1$).
- ◆ Regular Vocational/Technical Education Programs: Building Trades ($n = 13$), Auto Mechanics/Auto-Body Repair ($n = 12$), Computer Programming/Operations ($n = 5$), Drafting/Graphic Arts, Electronics, and Culinary Arts/Food Service Occupations ($n = 2$ each), Farming/Agriculture/Horticulture/Forestry, Commercial Arts, Machine Trades, Health Care Occupations, Home Economics/Dietetics/Child Care/Human Services ($n = 1$ each).
- ◆ Social Vocational Education Programs: Vocational Special Needs Resource Teacher Programs ($n = 3$), Community-Based On-the-Job Training and Career Center ($n = 2$ each), Jobs for Maine Graduates and Special Class Industrial Arts ($n = 1$ each).
- ◆ Extracurricular Activities: Other ($n = 22$)*, Athletics ($n = 4$), Vocational Clubs ($n = 3$), Student Newspaper/Yearbook ($n = 2$), Dramatics and Student Government ($n = 1$ each). *Other includes: welding, automotive, cdl class, computers, construction, cooking, creative writing, football, Hancock Tech, human relations, life skills, Maine Corp, math, orientation leader, plumbing and heating, and vocational classes.
- ◆ Ninety-four students (19%) reported that they did not find any classes or programs to be helpful.

Other Activities During Academic Year

Approximately half of all respondents (44%) stated that they did participate in extracurricular activities while in high school. Similarly, about half (49%) also held a paying job while in high school. Forty-two percent (42%) of those holding a paying job during high school worked anywhere from 16 to 20

hours a week. Of the 242 respondents reporting that they held a paying job while attending high school, over half (60%, $n = 130$) also indicated that they participated in extracurricular activities. (See Tables 13-15 for complete results.)

Table 13. Did you participate in extracurricular activities while in high school?

	<i>n</i>	%
No	245	49%
Yes	217	44%
No response	35	7%
Total	$N = 497$	100%

Table 14. Did you have a paying job while you attended high school?

	<i>n</i>	%
Yes	242	49%
No	239	48%
No response	16	3%
Total	$N = 497$	100%

Table 15. Number of hours worked per week while attending high school.

	<i>n</i>	%
31-40 hours	7	3%
21-30 hours	26	11%
16-20 hours	102	42%
11-15 hours	51	21%
6-10 hours	39	16%
0-5 hours	2	<.05%
Total (Includes 15 no response.)	<i>N</i> = 242	100%

Plans to Reality

About half of all respondents (44%) reported that before exiting high school they had planned to attend either a two- or four-year college. An additional 19% of students (*n* = 94) planned to continue their education either by attending a vocational/technical program or participating in some other education program. Only 13 respondents (3%) had planned to enlist in the military upon leaving high school. (See Table 16.)

are enrolled in either a two- or four-year college. Of those attending a technical college (*n* = 76, 15% of all respondents), nearly all (86%) did not enter through an articulation agreement. Approximately half of all respondents (44%) stated that they have not participated in any training or coursework since leaving high school. Fifteen respondents (3%) had indeed enlisted in the military by the time of this survey. (See Tables 17-19.)

Thirty-nine percent of all respondents (*n* = 195) are currently in school. Most of these students (72%)

Table 16. Before exiting high school what did you plan to do?

	<i>n</i>	%
Attend a two-year college	119	24%
Attend a four-year college	100	20%
Not sure at this time	76	15%
Attend a vocational/technical program	75	15%
Work full time	64	13%
Other education program ^a	19	4%
Work part-time	14	3%
Enlist in the military	13	3%
Be a homemaker	4	1%
No response	13	3%
Total	<i>N</i> = 497	100%

^aJob corp (*n* = 5), cosmetology (*n* = 2), for all others (*n* = 1) - adult education program, day program, Families Matters, Inc, get reeducated, home skilled, jail, Job Core, life skills, living skills, post-grad program, repeat 11th and 12th grades to gain high school diploma that meets academic standards to get into college.

Table 17. Are you in school now?

	<i>n</i>	%
No	289	58%
Yes	195	39%
No response	13	3%
Total	<i>N</i> = 497	100%

Table 18. What type of school or program do you currently attend?

	<i>n</i>	%
Two-year college	76	39%
Four-year college	64	33%
Vocational or technical school	30	15%
Adult education	4	2%
GED program or other high school diploma equivalency	2	1%
Post-graduate high school program	2	1%
Other ^a	15	8%
Total ^b	193	100%

^aThree-year associates, AMAC, correspondence courses, day program, home schooling, Job Corp, living, Maine Maritime Academy, military school, MMI, secondary school for adolescents with learning differences, Sylvan Learning Center, TUDOR

^bThis question was only asked of those respondents who indicated that they are now in school (see Table 17). Total is two less than expected due to two respondents indicating "none."

Table 19. Since leaving high school, have you had additional training or coursework?

	<i>n</i>	% ^a
Have not participated in any training or coursework	218	44%
Vocational/Technical Education	53	11%
College or University Courses (non-degree)	105	21%
GED	13	3%
Adult Basic Education (ABE) (credit or non-credit)	14	3%
Military	7	1%
Job Corps	10	2%
Supported Employment	10	2%
On-the-Job Training Provided by Employer or Outside Agency	30	6%
Other	34	7%

^aPercentage is of the total number of survey respondents (*N* = 497).

Job Status

Slightly more than half of all respondents (56%, *n* = 276) reported that they currently have a paying job. Retail sales, restaurant work, and construction trades accounted for nearly 30% of these respondents. Three quarters (76%) of all employed

in a paying job are receiving compensation that is above the minimum wage (> \$6.50/hour). Seventy-one percent are not receiving benefits as part of their compensation.

Of those who do not currently hold a paying job, about a third (30%) are currently seeking employment and/or are coming across barriers to

employment. Nearly one tenth (9%) of unemployed participants are currently participating in some form of job training. (See Tables 20- 23).

Table 20. Respondent Reasons for Unemployment

	<i>n</i>	%
Unemployed/Seeking Employment	34	15%
Barriers to Employment	34	15%
Unemployed/Between Jobs	20	9%
Job Training	19	9%
Unemployed/Not Seeking Employment	8	4%
Unpaid Work	7	3%
Sheltered Work/Day Treatment	5	2%
Other	29	13%
No response	65	30%
Total (number of respondents who do not currently have a paying job)	221	100%

Table 21. Which of these occupations comes closest to what you are currently doing for work?

	<i>n</i>	%
Retail sales	29	11%
Restaurant Work/Good Service (waiter, dishwasher, etc.)	24	9%
Construction Trades (carpentry, masonry, plumbing, etc.)	21	8%
Human Services/Work with People/Children	6	2%
Janitorial/Housekeeping/Maintenance/Groundskeeping	6	2%
Military Service	6	2%
Auto Mechanics/Auto Body Repair	5	2%
Materials Handler/Loader/Teamster/Warehouse Worker	5	2%
Computer Programming/Operations	5	2%
Secretarial/Stenographic/Typing or Other Office Work	5	2%
Hotel/Tourism	4	1%
Machine Trades	4	1%
Assembly (factory work)	3	1%
Stock Clerk/Stock Boy or Girl	3	1%
Cosmetology/Hairdressing/Barbering	2	1%
Gas Station Attendant	2	1%
Marine Trades (ship/boat building, etc)	2	1%
Fishing/Lobstering	2	1%
Artistic (painting, dramatics, music, entertainment)	2	1%
Electronics	1	< .05%
Farm Work/Working with Animals	1	< .05%
Total ^a	276	100%

^aA total of 276 respondents indicated that they currently have a paying job.

Table 22. Salary

	<i>n</i>	%
Above minimum wage (> \$6.50/hr)	210	76%
Minimum wage (\$6.50/hr)	45	16%
I don't know.	7	3%
By the job/ Whatever they'll pay me, etc	5	2%
Below minimum wage (\$.01 to \$6.49/hr)	1	< .05%
No response	6	2%
Total ^a	276	100%

^aThe *N* used to calculate percentages for this table was 276 since that is the number of respondents who indicated they had a paying job.

Table 23. Do you receive any benefits with this job?

	<i>n</i>	%
No	196	71%
Yes	58	21%
Don't Know	13	5%
No response	9	3%
Total ^(a)	276	100%

^aThe *N* used to calculate percentages for this table was 276 since that is the number of respondents who indicated they had a paying job.

Dreaming of a Better Life

Many respondents felt that more money would make both their work life (30%) and life in general (19%) better. About one fifth of respondents (19%) indicated that they would not change anything in either their work life or their life in general. Eleven percent (11%) of respondents stated that they

believed going to college or vocational school may have or would make their work life better. Nearly one tenth (9%) of respondents indicated that their life in general might be better if they were able to obtain a driver's license. (See Table 24 and 25 for complete results.)

Table 24. What is the main thing you would add or change that would make your work life better?

	<i>n</i>	%
More money	82	30%
I would not change anything	51	19%
Go to college or vocational school	29	11%
Don't know	27	10%
Have a different job	21	8%
Car/Driver's license	11	4%
Finish high school	7	1%
Find solutions to my personal problems	3	<.05%
Be able to make more choices about my life	2	<.05%
Other	33	12%
No response	14	5%
Total ^a	<i>N</i> = 276	100%

^aThe *N* used to calculate percentages for this table was 276 since that is the number of respondents who indicated they had a paying job.

Table 25. What is the main thing you would add or change that would make your life better?

	<i>n</i>	%
More money	95	19%
I wouldn't change anything	94	19%
Don't know	84	17%
Car/Driver's license	44	9%
Change in work situation	36	7%
New place to live	16	3%
Find solutions to my personal problems	8	2%
Be able to make more choices about my life	7	1%
Love, marriage, close relationship	6	1%
More/different friends	4	1%
More/better things to do during free time	3	1%
Other	58	12%
No response	42	9%
Total	<i>N</i> = 497	100%

V. Limitations

A total of 626 students (30% of the total approached) were successfully contacted. Of these 626 students, nearly 500 completed the survey ($N = 497$, 24% of total approached). Fifty eight (12%) of these surveys were completed online. The remaining 433 (88%) were conducted over the telephone. One fifth ($n = 128$) of the students successfully contacted refused to complete the survey. An additional 9 students (1%) only partially completed the survey.

Of all the attempted contacts, there were a total of 85 graduates for whom there was both no valid phone number or mailing address listed. Being unable to contact these students is a clear limitation of this study. Fortunately, students who fell into this category represent only 4% of the entire target population.

VI. Summary

How Do Respondents Compare to the Total Target Population?

After carefully comparing the target population of nearly 2,100 high school students who had both participated in special education and were scheduled to graduate in May of 2005 with the surveyed population consisting of nearly 500 of these students, it appears that their similarities are such that it is appropriate to make assumptions

about the entire target population based upon the information provided by the respondents. Variables compared between the two populations were means of exiting high school special education program, special education placement, and participant disability.

Characteristics of the Surveyed Population

Approximately three quarters of all respondents completed their high school programs with a

diploma, with an additional 6% graduating through a certificate program or fulfillment of an I.E.P.

requirement. When looking at graduation rates based on special education placement, students placed in a regular classrooms or resource rooms were significantly more likely to graduate with a diploma than those in other types of placement. Homebound or hospitalized students were less likely to graduate with a diploma and were more likely to drop out than those in other placement situations.

The Survey

Most students were active participants when it came to transition planning. Although few stated they had led or facilitated their IEP/PET meeting, most felt that their own preferences and interests were taken into consideration during the resulting discussions.

Approximately half of all respondents participated in extracurricular activities during their high school years. Similarly, about half also held paying jobs, and nearly half reported working 16-20 hours a week. Of those students who worked for money during high school, more than half also participated in extracurricular activities.

About half of all students reported that, before leaving high school, they had planned to attend either a two- or four-year college. An additional one fifth of all respondents had planned to continue their education either by attending a vocational/technical program or by participating in some other education program. As of the time of this survey, 39% of respondents were currently in school. Most of these students were enrolled in either a two- or four-year

Nearly half of all respondents were participating in special education programming because of a learning disability. When looking at graduation rates based on disability, students with and emotional disability or who are multihandicapped are less likely to graduate with a diploma than students with other disabilities. Students with an emotional disability were also more likely to drop out than those with other disabilities.

college. Of those attending a technical college, most had not entered through an articulation agreement.

Slightly more than half of all students indicated that they have a paying job. Retail sales, restaurant work, and construction trades accounted for nearly a third of these students. Three quarters of all employed in a paying job are receiving compensation that is above minimum wage. Nearly three quarters of respondents are not receiving benefits as part of their compensation.

Many respondents indicated that more money would make both their work life and life in general better. About one fifth of all respondents stated that they would not change anything in either their work life or their life in general. Approximately 1 out of every 10 respondents believe that going to college or vocational school may have made or would make their work life better. A similar proportion of respondents also indicated that their life in general might be better if they were able to obtain a driver's license.

Appendix A
Survey Responses Based On Respondent Means of Program Exit

Table A1. Did you actively participate in transition planning?

	Graduated with Diploma		Dropped Out		Graduated through Certificate/Fulfillment of I.E.P. Requirement		Reached Maximum Age		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Yes, Outside of the IEP meeting	190	50%	36	44%	15	54%	1	20%	242	49%
Yes, During the IEP meeting	264	69%	53	65%	20	71%	1	20%	338	68%
No	64	17%	17	21%	3	11%	3	60%	87	18%

Note: Some subjects provided multiple responses.

Table A2. Did you lead/facilitate your IEP/PET meeting?

	Graduated with Diploma		Dropped Out		Graduated through Certificate/Fulfillment of I.E.P. Requirement		Reached Maximum Age		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
No	320	84%	74	90%	24	86%	3	60%	421	85%
Yes	50	13%	3	4%	4	14%	1	20%	58	12%
No response	12	3%	5	6%	0	0%	1	20%	18	4%
Total	382	100%	82	100%	28	100%	5	100%	497	100%

Table A3. Were steps taken to ensure that your preferences and interests were taken into consideration in the IEP/PET discussions?

	Graduated with Diploma		Dropped Out		Graduated through Certificate/Fulfillment of I.E.P. Requirement		Reached Maximum Age		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Yes	320	84%	66	80%	25	89%	3	60%	414	83%
No	54	14%	12	15%	2	7%	1	20%	69	14%
No response	8	2%	4	5%	1	4%	1	20%	14	3%
Total	382	100%	82	100%	28	100%	5	100%	497	100%

Table A4. Did you participate in extracurricular activities while in high school?

	Graduated with Diploma		Dropped Out		Graduated through Certificate/Fulfillment of I.E.P. Requirement		Reached Maximum Age		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
No	172	45%	55	67%	15	54%	3	60%	245	49%
Yes	183	48%	21	26%	13	46%	0	0%	217	44%
No response	27	7%	6	7%	0	0%	2	40%	35	7%
Total	382	100%	82	100%	28	100%	5	100%	497	100%

Table A5. Did you have a paying job while you attended high school?

	Graduated with Diploma		Dropped Out		Graduated through Certificate/Fulfillment of I.E.P. Requirement		Reached Maximum Age		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Yes	204	53%	31	38%	6	21%	1	20%	242	49%
No	169	44%	45	55%	22	79%	3	60%	239	48%
No response	9	2%	6	7%	0	0%	1	20%	16	3%
Total	382	100%	82	100%	28	100%	5	100%	497	100%

Table A6. Are you in school now?

	Graduated with Diploma		Dropped Out		Graduated through Certificate/Fulfillment of I.E.P. Requirement		Reached Maximum Age		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
No	211	55%	57	70%	18	64%	3	60%	289	58%
Yes	163	43%	22	27%	10	36%	0	0%	195	39%
No response	8	2%	3	4%	0	0%	2	40%	13	3%
Total	382	100%	82	100%	28	100%	5	100%	497	100%

Appendix B

Survey Responses Based On Respondent Disability

Table B1. Did you actively participate in transition planning?

	Yes, Outside of the IEP meeting		Yes, During the IEP meeting		No	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Learning Disability	110	53%	144	70%	29	14%
Other Health Impairment	36	48%	50	67%	13	17%
Multihandicapped	38	53%	56	78%	10	14%
Emotional Disability	21	37%	35	61%	15	26%
Speech and Language Impairment	12	34%	21	60%	9	26%
Mental Retardation	12	50%	18	75%	3	13%
Autism	6	40%	8	53%	5	33%
Traumatic Brain Injury	3	60%	1	20%	2	40%
Hearing Impairment	2	50%	2	50%	1	25%
Visual Impairment	1	50%	2	100%	0	0%
Deaf	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%
Total	242	49%	338	68%	87	18%

Table B2. Did you lead/facilitate your IEP/PET meeting?

	No		Yes		No response		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Learning Disability	170	82%	30	14%	7	3%	207	100%
Other Health Impairment	67	89%	6	8%	2	3%	75	100%
Multihandicapped	58	81%	11	15%	3	4%	72	100%
Emotional Disability	51	89%	3	5%	3	5%	57	100%
Speech and Language Impairment	31	89%	3	9%	1	3%	35	100%
Mental Retardation	21	88%	2	8%	1	4%	24	100%
Autism	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	15	100%
Traumatic Brain Injury	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%
Hearing Impairment	3	75%	0	0%	1	25%	4	100%
Visual Impairment	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%
Deaf	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Total	421	85%	58	12%	18	4%	497	100%

Table B3. Were steps taken to ensure that your preferences and interests were taken into consideration in the IEP/PET discussions?

	Yes		No		No response		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Learning Disability	174	84%	27	13%	6	3%	207	100%
Other Health Impairment	65	87%	9	12%	1	1%	75	100%
Multihandicapped	64	89%	7	10%	1	1%	72	100%
Emotional Disability	42	74%	12	21%	3	5%	57	100%
Speech and Language Impairment	27	77%	7	20%	1	3%	35	100%
Mental Retardation	20	83%	2	8%	2	8%	24	100%
Autism	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	15	100%
Traumatic Brain Injury	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%	5	100%
Hearing Impairment	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	4	100%
Visual Impairment	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%
Deaf	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%
Total	414	83%	69	14%	14	3%	497	100%

Table B4. Did you participate in extracurricular activities while in high school?

	No		Yes		No response		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Learning Disability	82	40%	109	53%	16	8%	207	100%
Other Health Impairment	40	53%	30	40%	5	7%	75	100%
Multihandicapped	36	50%	34	47%	2	3%	72	100%
Emotional Disability	38	67%	14	25%	5	9%	57	100%
Speech and Language Impairment	19	54%	14	40%	2	6%	35	100%
Mental Retardation	15	63%	5	21%	4	17%	24	100%
Autism	9	60%	6	40%	0	0%	15	100%
Traumatic Brain Injury	2	40%	2	40%	1	20%	5	100%
Hearing Impairment	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	4	100%
Visual Impairment	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	2	100%
Deaf	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%
Total	245	49%	217	44%	35	7%	497	100%

Table B5. Did you have a paying job while you attended high school?

	No		Yes		No response		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Learning Disability	114	55%	86	42%	7	3%	207	100%
Other Health Impairment	46	61%	28	37%	1	1%	75	100%
Multihandicapped	18	25%	52	72%	2	3%	72	100%
Emotional Disability	21	37%	32	56%	4	7%	57	100%
Speech and Language Impairment	23	66%	11	31%	1	3%	35	100%
Mental Retardation	7	29%	16	67%	1	4%	24	100%
Autism	7	47%	8	53%	0	0%	15	100%
Traumatic Brain Injury	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	5	100%
Hearing Impairment	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	4	100%
Visual Impairment	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%
Deaf	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Total	242	49%	239	48%	16	3%	497	100%

Table B6. Are you in school now?

	No		Yes		No response		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Learning Disability	112	54%	90	43%	5	2%	207	100%
Other Health Impairment	41	55%	33	44%	1	1%	75	100%
Multihandicapped	48	67%	23	32%	1	1%	72	100%
Emotional Disability	36	63%	17	30%	4	7%	57	100%
Speech and Language Impairment	19	54%	15	43%	1	3%	35	100%
Mental Retardation	20	83%	3	13%	1	4%	24	100%
Autism	7	47%	8	53%	0	0%	15	100%
Traumatic Brain Injury	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	5	100%
Hearing Impairment	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	4	100%
Visual Impairment	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%
Deaf	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%
Total	289	58%	195	39%	13	3%	497	100%

Appendix C

Survey Responses Based On Special Education Placement

Table C1. Did you actively participate in transition planning?

	Yes, outside of the IEP meeting		Yes, during the IEP meeting		No	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Regular Class	119	46%	173	68%	42	16%
Resource Room	63	53%	86	72%	17	14%
Self-Contained	28	47%	39	65%	13	22%
Information not provided	14	56%	19	76%	4	16%
Private Separate Day School	8	50%	9	56%	5	31%
Public Separate Day School	5	56%	6	67%	3	33%
Homebound or Hospital	1	20%	2	40%	3	60%
Information Not Provided	3	100%	1	33%	0	0%
Information not provided	1	33%	3	100%	0	0%
Total	242	49%	338	68%	87	18%

Table C2. Did you lead/facilitate your IEP/PET meeting?

	No		Yes		No response		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Regular Class	213	83%	32	13%	11	4%	256	100%
Resource Room	105	88%	11	9%	4	3%	120	100%
Self-Contained	51	85%	7	12%	2	3%	60	100%
Information not provided	20	80%	4	16%	1	4%	25	100%
Private Separate Day School	14	88%	2	13%	0	0%	16	100%
Public Separate Day School	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	9	100%
Homebound or Hospital	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%
Information Not Provided	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%
Information not provided	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	3	100%
Total	421	85%	58	12%	18	4%	497	100%

Table C3. Were steps taken to ensure that your preferences and interests were taken into consideration in the IEP/PET discussions?

	Yes		No		No response		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Regular Class	216	84%	31	12%	9	4%	256	100%
Resource Room	103	86%	15	13%	2	2%	120	100%
Self-Contained	47	78%	12	20%	1	2%	60	100%
Information not provided	20	80%	4	16%	1	4%	25	100%
Private Separate Day School	10	63%	6	38%	0	0%	16	100%
Public Separate Day School	7	78%	1	11%	1	11%	9	100%
Homebound or Hospital	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%
Information Not Provided	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%
Information not provided	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%
Total	414	83%	69	14%	14	3%	497	100%

Table C4. Did you participate in extracurricular activities while in high school?

	No		Yes		No response		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Regular Class	122	48%	116	45%	18	7%	256	100%
Resource Room	51	43%	59	49%	10	8%	120	100%
Self-Contained	38	63%	17	28%	5	8%	60	100%
Information not provided	7	28%	16	64%	2	8%	25	100%
Private Separate Day School	12	75%	4	25%	0	0%	16	100%
Public Separate Day School	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	9	100%
Homebound or Hospital	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	5	100%
Information Not Provided	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	3	100%
Information not provided	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%	3	100%
Total	245	49%	217	44%	35	7%	497	100%

Table C5. Did you have a paying job while you attended high school?

	Yes		No		No response		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Regular Class	141	55%	104	41%	11	4%	256	100%
Resource Room	58	48%	58	48%	4	3%	120	100%
Self-Contained	16	27%	43	72%	1	2%	60	100%
Information not provided	17	68%	8	32%	0	0%	25	100%
Private Separate Day School	4	25%	12	75%	0	0%	16	100%
Public Separate Day School	2	22%	7	78%	0	0%	9	100%
Homebound or Hospital	1	20%	4	80%	0	0%	5	100%
Information Not Provided	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%	3	100%
Information not provided	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	3	100%
Total	242	49%	239	48%	16	3%	497	100%

Table C6. Are you in school now?

	No		Yes		No response		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Regular Class	139	54%	109	43%	8	3%	256	100%
Resource Room	69	58%	48	40%	3	3%	120	100%
Self-Contained	43	72%	15	25%	2	3%	60	100%
Information not provided	12	48%	13	52%	0	0%	25	100%
Private Separate Day School	11	69%	5	31%	0	0%	16	100%
Public Separate Day School	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	9	100%
Homebound or Hospital	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	5	100%
Information Not Provided	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	3	100%
Information not provided	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	3	100%
Total	289	58%	195	39%	13	3%	497	100%

TABLE 7

REPORT OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION UNDER PART B, OF THE
INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT
2006-07

PAGE 1 OF 1

OMB NO.: 1820-0677

FORM EXPIRES: XX/XX/XXXX

STATE:

ME - MAINE

SECTION A: WRITTEN, SIGNED COMPLAINTS	
(1) Written, signed complaints total	59
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	15
(a) Reports with findings	9
(b) Reports within timelines	3
(c) Reports with extended timelines	12
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	44
(1.3) Complaints pending	0
(a) Complaint pending a due process hearing	0

SECTION B: MEDIATION REQUESTS	
(2) Mediation requests total	122
(2.1) Mediations	52
(a) Mediations related to due process	9
(i) Mediation agreements	7
(b) Mediations not related to due process	43
(i) Mediation agreements	37
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	70

SECTION C: HEARING REQUESTS	
(3) Hearing requests total	37
(3.1) Resolution sessions	2
(a) Settlement agreements	1
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	6
(a) Decisions within timeline	0
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	6
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	30

SECTION D: EXPEDITED HEARING REQUESTS (RELATED TO DISCIPLINARY DECISION)	
(4) Expedited hearing requests total	6
(4.1) Resolution sessions	0
(a) Settlement agreements	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated)	0
(a) Change of placement ordered	0