


Maine Department of Education

# Annual Performance Report - Part B

Fiscal Year July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008

April 7, 2009 Clarification and Corrections to Data  
Update to the February 2, 2009 submission



Federal Fiscal Year  
**2007**

## **Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007**

### ***Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:***

This Annual Performance Report (APR) is the third report of the progress toward the Measureable and Rigorous targets established in the State Performance Plan (SPP) on December 2, 2005. This APR reports improvement in a number of key indicators of the plan resulting from efforts in multiple program and support areas in the state of Maine.

### **Stakeholder group activities**

Maine Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (MACECD) is the stakeholder group providing guidance and support to the Maine Department of Education in implementing the State Performance Plan (SPP). As a group of dedicated volunteers with the best interests of kids with disabilities ages birth through 20 in mind, MACECD started its year with a two day planning meeting. MACECD began its work on the Annual Performance Report (APR) and the SPP. They were asked by the Maine Department of Education to look at the documents with a critical eye and assess what needed to be addressed in order to ensure accurate and adequate service delivery to the students receiving Special Education Services in the state of Maine.

An early task in MACECD's two-day planning meeting was the formation of four committees to concentrate on specific sub-sets of the indicators for the year: Due Process and Quality Assurance Monitoring (B-15 through B-20, C-9 through C-14) ; Early Transition (C-2 through C-8, B-6 and B-12); Student Performance (B-1 through B7, B-14); and Evaluation, Services and Treatment (C-1, C-7, B-8 through B-10). MACECD's monthly agenda includes items for the MACECD membership as well as committee breakout sessions. The committees assess data and make advisory recommendations to the Commissioner of Education on unmet needs from the committees' respective subject areas. The recommendations are addressed and integrated into the operational execution of the Department (program review, dispute resolution, funding, technical assistance, professional development, and discretionary programs) to improve support to special education students statewide.

### **Improvement Activities in the Preschool System**

Maine's Child Development Services (CDS) is in its third year of significant restructuring. As with all change, pieces start to fall into place as the years progress. The conversion of CDS system from the 16 regional sites to the CDS State Intermediate Educational Unit (IEU) is completed or significantly underway. New personnel have been added at the CDS State IEU and there are now two teams in place: 1) a management team to address fiscal, data, HR and policy issues, and 2) a separate policy team to address the SPP. The CDS State IEU policy team consists of 1) the Data Specialist, 2) the birth to age five consultant for monitoring and technical assistance, 3) the birth to age five consultant for intervention, programming, and staff development, and 4) the CDS State Director (Part C / Part B Section 619 Coordinator). The policy team focused this past year on the performance of CDS sites on the Part B SPP indicators and the structure of the support the CDS State IEU can offer through a general supervision system. The policy team met frequently and studied the sources of information and data that

are available to describe the performance of our system and what those sources were providing to the CDS State IEU.

With technical assistance from NERRC, CDS State IEU staff developed a General Supervision System (GSST) [http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/cds/supervision/gsst\\_109.ppt](http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/cds/supervision/gsst_109.ppt) that references the general supervision system “The Big 8” developed by OSEP. The CDS State IEU shared this system with the CDS State Level Advisory Board on a monthly basis since September through presentations by the CDS State Director, the Assistant Attorney General for Education and Larry Ringer from OSEP. Additionally, the CDS State Director presented to the Maine Advisory Council (MACECD), all site directors, and staff representatives who attended the Child Outcomes Summary Form Training Session. Informational Letter Number 2 was sent January 9, 2009 with the PowerPoint as a hyperlink (<http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/cds/infoltrs/ltr2profiles.pdf>). Additional information is provided at CDS State IEU weekly Lunch and Learn sessions hosted by the Assistant Attorney General for Education.

The CDS State IEU has worked closely with the school aged system to ensure there is consistency in determination responses. The CDS State IEU has monitored each of the 16 sites annually the past two years and is well positioned to start the “response to determination” portion of the GSST system July 1, 2009. The CDS State Level Advisory Board has made a decision to focus on one SPP indicator at each meeting. This will ensure that there is knowledge at the management level to support each site in their efforts to reach targets. The CDS State IEU has made it clear to regional sites that noncompliance is not acceptable. There is a growing acknowledgement at the staff, site director, and board management level that this is a serious undertaking and profile indicators of with determinations of Needs Assistance or worse will be addressed through the “response to determination” portion of our GSST. This will involve self assessment, internal monitoring, and increasing levels of interaction between the site and the CDS State IEU.

### **Public reporting**

Data profile designs based on the 2006-2007 performance and compliance data were developed for each Local Educational Agency (LEA), including CDS sites and School Administrative Units, in the state. The profiles provide indicator specific performance and compliance data to the LEA and to the public for use in program improvement. District performance profiles were made public with Informational Letter # 51 ([http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=edu\\_letters&id=65681&v=article](http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=edu_letters&id=65681&v=article)).

The LEA profiles are used as the basis for determinations of LEA program performance. Each indicator is evaluated for level of determination to provide the LEA with measurement specific feedback on their implementation of IDEA with regard to the SPP indicators. The individual determinations are then used to develop an overall determination to the requirements of the State Performance Plan (SPP) in one of the four required categories: Meets Requirements; Needs Assistance; Needs Intervention; or Needs Substantial Intervention. These

determinations set the level of support and intervention provided under the Maine's Continuous Improvement Monitoring Program (CIMP) discussed further below. The process of improvement in the state is evolving. At the time of the origination of the SPP, LEAs understood very little of the requirements of the IDEA reauthorization of 2004. All data profiles, each revision of the SPP and APR and all technical assistance documentation are posted on web pages on the Maine Department of Education website (Beginning at: <http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/index.html>).

## **Technical Assistance**

During FFY2005, The Maine Department of Education (MDOE) developed an informative presentation that was delivered in regional meetings throughout the state to inform the LEA of the requirements of the law and reporting. The LEAs received detailed information on the SPP, the indicators and their intent, and an early glimpse of the expected consequences of poor performance or non-compliance. In FFY2006 the Department conducted a continuing series of informational and technical assistance meetings where the data for the first year of public reporting were shared using an indicator by indicator description of the performance measurements and the compliance requirements. These meetings provided an opportunity for LEAs to review their LEA specific data in a forum where data experts could respond to questions and encourage improvement planning. The data presented and discussed included the initial LEA determinations, a description of levels of determination, and the time-phased interventions and sanctions provided in IDEA law and regulation. During FFY 2007, the technical assistance became more intense and directed at specific LEAs demonstrating determination levels of Needs Assistance and Needs Intervention. LEAs with the lowest determination levels were asked to contact the Maine Department of Education and RMC Research for additional support and technical assistance. Each LEA was provided with a self-assessment protocol and guidance to prepare an improvement plan addressing the determinations in their first year profile. Several LEAs completed the initial self-assessment. In FFY 2008, the intensity increased further with the evolution of CIMP.

## **Maine's Continuous Improvement Monitoring Program (CIMP)**

### **Three Step Process to Achieve Improved Educational Results for Children with Disabilities**

The Maine Department of Education (MDOE) Office of Special Services implements a birth through age 20 Continuous Improvement and Monitoring Program (CIMP). CIMP interventions focus on improving infant, toddler and school-age student outcomes. CIMP is designed to enhance partnerships among the MDOE Office of Special Services, Child Development Services (CDS) sites, School Administrative Units, other educational and community agencies, service providers, and parents in implementing Part C and Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). These partnerships focus on early intervention and special education services and systems that directly impact results for children, and on the development and implementation of improvement strategies to address identified needs.

The CIMP is an LEA-driven process founded on evidence-based decision-making and aligns with IDEA State Performance Plan (SPP) compliance and performance indicators. This alignment

supports a close relationship between special education improvement planning and other LEA or community improvement planning efforts.

The CIMP utilizes an annual three-step process.

Step 1. Self-Assessment: Data Collection/Data Interpretation;

Step 2. Improvement/Corrective Action Plan Development; and

Step 3. Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation using the LEA Performance Profile.

## **Training**

The State Performance Plan Indicator Response and Improvement Team (**SPPIRIT**) coordinates winter/spring Webinar training for LEA CIMP teams on the three-step process. LEA CIMP teams complete assignments for each section of the Self-Assessment thereby demonstrating their ability to translate the data findings in their LEA Profile to action steps in their Improvement/Corrective Action Plan.

## **Determination Levels of LEAs**

All LEAs receive and review on a yearly basis a letter with their determination status, the rubric “Local Determination Levels Assistance and Enforcement”, and the LEA profile. Documents available: <http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/profiles.html>

## **Appeal Process**

LEAs whose determination level is at the Needs Intervention or Needs Substantial Intervention have the opportunity to request a reconsideration of their data which, if adjusted, would move the LEA to a higher level and therefore not risk the loss of full or partial funding. The LEA may request a hearing after receiving a certified letter from the Commissioner of the Department of Education by following the procedure in “Challenges to Determination Levels and Withholding of Funds.” Document available on: <http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/index.html>

## **Challenges**

CIMP, with its Improvement/Corrective Action Plan is a new approach for the Maine Department of Education Office of Special Services. No Child Left Behind (NCLB) has institutionalized the use of an NCLB improvement plan for many years in the LEAs. Even though IDEA and NCLB share indicators such as graduation, drop out, assessment and suspension and expulsion recent efforts to consolidate these plans have not been successful due to personnel changes and funding allocations within the Department’s offices that represent IDEA and NCLB.

## **Alignment with Nation Technical Assistance Resources**

Maine contracts with technical assistance, professional development and dissemination resource throughout the state to provide scientifically based materials and instruction to educators, parents and interested parties. Contracts developed during the 2008-2009 school year include an objective requiring the contractor to serve as a liaison between the Department and national technical assistance centers that provide scientifically researched based resources that can be useful for Local Education Agencies (LEAs).

## **Data System**

Maine contracted with Infinite Campus to provide a statewide student data management system enhancement to the Maine Education Data Management System (MEDMS). Features and capabilities will significantly improve data reporting ease while providing increased performance, data backups, and integral data validations. This reporting year, data were provided from the MEDMS for the 2007-2008 school year. The data are valid and reliable, but require a number of external validation and confirmations to ensure complete and correct data entry. The Infinite Campus implementation provides a modern database system and industry standard forms designed to greatly simplify adapting the system to collect needed data. Reports of 618 child count, discipline, assessment performance, personnel, exits, and student demographic information are all compiled from a single data source in MEDMS, and that capability will continue with the Infinite Campus implementation. Additionally, the Infinite Campus implementation is integrated with Maine's Longitudinal Data Grant (CFDA 84.372A) to ensure compatibility of the data system with the state's future requirements and historical data stores.

## **Consolidation**

Maine continues its LEA consolidation efforts across the state. During the 2006-2007 school year, LEAs across the state began conversations about developing partnerships with nearby school administrative units about the possibility of regionalizing 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 through the SPP process. An expectation of the consolidation 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 students in a way that will compromise comparison of LEA percentages until the consolidation effort is complete in 2010.

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 FFY2007, indicator 7 is 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.

Legend

<p><i>OSEP Status table titled “Maine Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Status Table “, April 2009; requested clarification or data corrections to Maine’s February 2, 2009 Annual Performance Plan submission. Applicable text from the table has been inserted into the indicator in this style (Calibri, 12pt, black, italic, yellow highlight).</i></p> <p>Maine’s response immediately follows as defined below.</p>
<p><b>April 3, 2009 Clarification and Correction of Data. All modifications, changes, corrections and edits from the February 2, 2009 submission are highlighted in yellow. Clarifications and/or changes in data are included on page numbers 1, 7, 8 (TOC), 13, 15-19(B-3), 23(B-4), 46(B-9), 53(B-11), 63(B-14), 66-73, 75(B-15), 83, 84, and 85(B-20) in this style (Calibri, 12pt, black, bold, yellow highlight). Corrected a typographical error on page 12 of 18 in Table 6.</b></p>
<p><b>Measurable and Rigorous Target data are presented in each indicator in this style (Calibri, 12 pt, bold, purple)</b></p>
<p><b><i>Actual performance/compliance data for FFY 2007 are presented in each indicator in this font style (Calibri, 12 pt, bold, italic, dark red)</i></b></p>
<p>OSEP’s Response Letter and Table, received June 6, 2008, requested a specific response in Maine’s February 1, 2009 APR for certain indicators. The text from the response table has been inserted into the narrative of the indicator in this style (Calibri, 11 pt, dark blue, gray highlight).</p> <p>Maine’s response immediately follows the inserted text.</p>
<p>Indicator 7 is reported on the SPP template. The narrative of the indicator is formatted in this style (Times New Roman, 12 pt, blue) to differentiate it from the APR template. Data elements are formatted as indicated above.</p>

Several indicators update SPP 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 13, 2009.

# Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007

## Table of Contents

<b>PART B STATE ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT (APR) FOR 2007.....</b>	<b>2</b>
OVERVIEW OF THE ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT DEVELOPMENT: .....	2
<b>MONITORING PRIORITY: FAPE IN THE LRE .....</b>	<b>9</b>
INDICATOR –: 1 .....	9
INDICATOR –: 2 .....	11
INDICATOR –: 3 .....	13
INDICATOR –: 4 .....	22
INDICATOR –: 5 .....	28
INDICATOR –: 6 .....	31
INDICATOR –: 7 .....	32
INDICATOR –: 8 .....	43
<b>MONITORING PRIORITY: DISPROPORTIONALITY .....</b>	<b>45</b>
INDICATOR –: 9 .....	45
INDICATOR –: 10 .....	47
<b>MONITORING PRIORITY: EFFECTIVE GENERAL SUPERVISION PART B / CHILD FIND .....</b>	<b>50</b>
INDICATOR –: 11 .....	50
INDICATOR –: 12 .....	54
INDICATOR –: 13 .....	58
INDICATOR –: 14 .....	61
<b>MONITORING PRIORITY: EFFECTIVE GENERAL SUPERVISION PART B / GENERAL SUPERVISION.....</b>	<b>65</b>
INDICATOR –: 15 .....	65
INDICATOR –: 16 .....	79
INDICATOR –: 17 .....	80
INDICATOR –: 18 .....	81
INDICATOR –: 19 .....	82
INDICATOR –: 20 .....	83

## APPENDIX

**Table 7** - REPORT OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION UNDER PART B, OF THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT 2007-08

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

**Table 5** - REPORT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007

### Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

<b>Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE</b>
---

**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:**

Percent = [#students graduating with a diploma /(#students graduating with a diploma + # dropouts + # certificates)] \* 100 = [ 1565 / ( 1565 + 429 + 76 ) ] \* 100 = 76%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Actual Target Data for 2007
2007	80%	76%

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007:**

The data reported for FFY2007 are complete and accurate; these data include graduates from all 125 public high schools in the state. Child count data (Table 1 and Table 4) were used for the calculations. 1565 special education students graduated with a diploma. 76 students received a Certificate/Fulfillment of I.E.P. Requirement, 429 dropped out. This yields a graduation rate of 75.6% (77%). This rate does not meet the 80% target for FFY2006.

Factor	Value
# Graduating with a diploma	1565
# IEP Certificate	76
# Special Ed Dropouts	429
Graduation Rate = 1565 / (1565 + 76 + 429) =	76%

Improvement activities implemented this year were aligned with public dissemination of data and determination of LEAs based on the FFY2006 performance and compliance results. The FFY2006 statewide graduation rate data were disaggregated to the LEA level and presented as one of the indicators of the district performance profiles made public with Informational Letter # 51

([http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=edu\\_letters&id=65681&v=article](http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=edu_letters&id=65681&v=article)).

The LEAs received direct mailing of additional copies of their data in a profile that included determinations of performance on critical performance measures and an overall determinations level assignment. Determinations are part of a LEA improvement process designed to promote improvement in specific SPP indicators through technical assistance and improvement planning provided by Maine Department of Education and its contractors.

Overall determination levels presented on the determination profiles initiate specific actions as described in “Local Determinations Levels Assistance and Enforcement Actions”. Additionally, the individual determination of the performance on this indicator requires action by the LEA if the determination is Need Assistance or lower. The degree of action and extent of sanction increases as the determination worsens. LEAs with high performance levels on this indicator will be reviewed for promising practices transferrable to lower performing LEAs.

The Continuous Improvement Monitoring Program Birth through 20 (CIMP) requires the self-assessment sections to result in an Individualized improvement plan. The CIMP includes a Self-assessment (Section 3) which is an in-depth self assessment of this indicator. This component has been developed by RMC Arlington VA by reviewing scientifically researched prototypes which have been formatted for Maine. By ranking six statements regarding Graduation Policies, Courses, and Programs of Study and four statements on High School Completion Data and Activities, the LEA has developed its own rubric with a rating score and priority rank. The items for improvement are targeted and transferred to the Improvement/Corrective Action Plan.

The indicator specific self assessment was adapted for Maine by RMC Arlington VA from School Dropout Prevention Program Self-Assessment Rubric (Maine Dropout Prevention Guide, 2006); Dropout Prevention Planning Guidebook: A Guide for School District Planning and Self-Assessment Tool (Reinvesting in Youth Dropout Prevention Initiative, 2006); and the National Standards and Quality Indicators for Secondary Education and Transition Self Assessment (National Alliance for Secondary Education and Transition, 2005).

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007:**

No revision of targets will be done this year. Changes in improvement strategies for FFY2008 and beyond:

Each LEA with a determination of Needs Assistance or lower will be required to complete an in-depth self-assessment of this indicator available on the Maine Department of Education website at: [http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/spp\\_ta.html](http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/spp_ta.html)

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007

### 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:

Percent = [ # number of dropouts / secondary enrollment ] \* 100 = **429 / 11703 = 3.7%**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	<i>Actual Target Data for 2007</i>
2007	3.5%	3.7%

#### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007:

The data presented for FFY 2007 are complete and accurate; the data includes dropouts and enrollment from all 125 public high schools in the state. 429 dropouts were recorded among 11,703 secondary students, for a dropout rate of 3.7% using the calculation methods presented in the measurement description above and in the State Performance Plan. Actual performance for dropout rate data slightly exceeds the target established for FFY 2007.

Improvement activities implemented this year were aligned with public dissemination of data and determination of LEAs based on the FFY2006 performance and compliance results. The FFY2006 statewide graduation rate data were disaggregated to the LEA level and presented as one of the indicators of the district performance profiles made public with Informational Letter # 51

([http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=edu\\_letters&id=65681&v=article](http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=edu_letters&id=65681&v=article)).

The LEAs received direct mailing of additional copies of their data in a profile that included determinations of performance on critical performance measures and an overall determinations level assignment. Determinations are part of a LEA improvement process designed to promote improvement in specific SPP indicators through technical assistance and improvement planning provided by Maine Department of Education and its contractors.

Overall determination levels presented on the determination profiles initiate specific actions as described in “Local Determinations Levels Assistance and Enforcement Actions” (link to

document on page: [http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/spp\\_ta.html](http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/spp_ta.html)). Additionally, the individual determination of the performance on this indicator requires action by the LEA if the determination is Need Assistance or lower. The degree of action and extent of sanction increases as the determination worsens. LEAs with high performance levels on this indicator will be reviewed for promising practices transferrable to lower performing LEAs.

The Continuous Improvement Monitoring Program Birth through 20 (CIMP) requires the self-assessment sections to result in an Individualized improvement plan. The CIMP includes a Self-assessment (Section 3) which is an in-depth self assessment of this indicator. This component has been developed by RMC Arlington VA by reviewing scientifically researched prototypes which have been formatted for Maine. By ranking six statements regarding Graduation Policies, Courses, and Programs of Study and four statements on High School Completion Data and Activities, the LEA has developed its own rubric with a rating score and priority rank. The items for improvement are targeted and transferred to the Improvement/Corrective Action Plan.

The indicator specific self assessment was adapted for Maine by RMC Arlington VA from School Dropout Prevention Program Self-Assessment Rubric (Maine Dropout Prevention Guide, 2006); Dropout Prevention Planning Guidebook: A Guide for School District Planning and Self-Assessment Tool (Reinvesting in Youth Dropout Prevention Initiative, 2006); and the National Standards and Quality Indicators for Secondary Education and Transition Self Assessment (National Alliance for Secondary Education and Transition, 2005).

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007:**

No revision of targets will be done this year. Changes in improvement strategies for FFY2008 and beyond:

Each LEA with a determination of Needs Assistance or lower will be required to complete an in-depth self-assessment of this indicator available on the Maine Department of Education website at: [http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/spp\\_ta.html](http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/spp_ta.html)

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007

### Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

**OSEP status table, April 2009:** *The measurement for Indicator 3B requires States to report participation and performance data by content area for each of the grades shown in Table 6 (grades 3-8 and a high school grade). See body of this indicator for specific responses to the omitted measurements.*

Maine provided data for grades 3 through 8 and grade 11 in Table 6, but provided only grade 4, 8 and 11 in the APR. Maine's State Performance Plan (SPP) had not been updated to provide targets for the additional grades. A meeting was held April 3, 2009 with members of the Council Coordination group of the Maine Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (Maine's SPP stakeholder group) to discuss the lack of targets. Council Coordination concluded that the most appropriate action would be to adopt grade 4 and 8 target for participation and adopt NCLB targets for the additional grades as had been for grades 4, 8, and 11 in the original development of the SPP. The target values have been added to indicator 3 in the SPP and will be used as targets for participation and performance for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 for FFY2007 and all subsequent years of the plan.

### 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:

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 = [(115 meet AYP for Reading) ÷ (125 total districts meeting minimum "n")] times 100 = **92.0**  
 Percent = [(124 meet AYP for Math) ÷ (125 total districts meeting minimum "n")] times 100 = **99.2**

**(numbers of students from Table 6 included in Appendix – state totals, all grades tested)**

Participation rate	Reading	Math
a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;	<b>17143</b>	<b>17138</b>
b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100);	<b>3181</b>	<b>3260</b>
c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = [(c) divided by (a)] times 100);	<b>12505</b>	<b>12477</b>
d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = [(d) divided by (a)] times 100); and	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = [(e) divided by (a)] times 100).	<b>1146</b>	<b>1140</b>
Children included in a but not included in the other counts above.		
State Approved Exemptions	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
First year LEP students	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Absent	<b>311</b>	<b>261</b>

Overall Percent (Reading) = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)] = **[(3181+12505+0+1146)÷17143] = 98.2**

Overall Percent (Math) = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)] = **[(3260+12477+0+1140)÷17138] = 98.5**

Proficiency rate	Reading	Math
a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;	<b>17143</b>	<b>17138</b>
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);	<b>1259</b>	<b>1052</b>
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);	<b>3052</b>	<b>2799</b>
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	<b>718</b>	<b>759</b>
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).	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
All children included in a are included in b, c, d, or e above		

Overall Percent (Reading) = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)] = **[(1259+3052+718+0)/17143] = 29**

Overall Percent (Math) = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)] = **[(1052+2799+759+0)/17143] = 27**

Performance against SPP Targets		
FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Actual Target Data for 2007
	<b>3A. AYP Reading [115/125] * 100 = 92.0</b>	
2007	97.5%	92.0%
	<b>3A. AYP Math [124/125] * 100 = 99.2</b>	
2007	99%	99.2%
	<b>3b. Participation Reading - Grade 3 [(2358-25)/2358]*100 = 98.9</b>	
2007	98%	98.9%
	<b>3b. Participation Reading - Grade 4 [(2524-20)/2524]*100 = 99.2</b>	
2007	98%	99.2%
	<b>3b. Participation Reading - Grade 5 [(2555-27)/2555]*100 = 98.9</b>	
2007	98%	98.9%
	<b>3b. Participation Reading - Grade 6 [(2518-39)/2518]*100 = 98.5</b>	
2007	98%	98.5%
	<b>3b. Participation Reading - Grade 7 [(2556-48)/2556]*100 = 98.1</b>	
2007	98%	98.1%
	<b>3b. Participation Reading - Grade 8 [(2508-62)/2508]*100 = 97.5</b>	
2007	98%	97.5%
	<b>3b. Participation Reading - Grade 11 [(2200-166)/2200]*100 = 92.5</b>	
2007	93%	92.5%
	<b>3b. Participation Math - Grade 3 [(2357-28)/2357]*100 = 98.8</b>	
2007	98%	99.2%
	<b>3b. Participation Math - Grade 4 [(2524-26)/2524]*100 = 99.0</b>	
2007	98%	99.0%
	<b>3b. Participation Math - Grade 5 [(2555-29)/2555]*100 = 98.9</b>	
2007	98%	98.9%
	<b>3b. Participation Math - Grade 6 [(2519-40)/2519]*100 = 98.4</b>	
2007	98%	98.4%
	<b>3b. Participation Math - Grade 7 [(2556-59)/2556]*100 = 97.7</b>	
2007	98%	97.7%
	<b>3b. Participation Math - Grade 8 [(2508-567)/2508]*100 = 97.3</b>	
2007	98%	97.3%
	<b>3b. Participation Math - Grade 11 [(2200-93)/2200]*100 = 95.7</b>	
2007	93%	95.7%
	<b>3c. Performance Reading - Grade 3 [786/2333]*100 = 33.7</b>	
2007	50%	33.7%
	<b>3c. Performance Reading - Grade 4 [788/2504]*100 = 31.5</b>	
2007	49%	31.5%
	<b>3c. Performance Reading - Grade 5 [723/2528]*100 = 28.6</b>	
2007	50%	28.6%

Performance against SPP Targets		
FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Actual Target Data for 2007
	<b>3c. Performance Reading - Grade 6 [836/2479]*100 = 33.7</b>	
2007	50%	33.7%
	<b>3c. Performance Reading - Grade 7 [862/2508]*100 = 34.4</b>	
2007	50%	34.4%
	<b>3c. Performance Reading - Grade 8 [704/2446]*100 = 28.8</b>	
2007	50%	28.8%
	<b>3c. Performance Reading - Grade 11 [330/2034]*100 = 16.2</b>	
2007	57%	16.2%
	<b>3c. Performance Math - Grade 3 [1019/2329]*100 = 43.8</b>	
2007	40%	43.8%
	<b>3c. Performance Math - Grade 4 [906/2498]*100 = 36.3</b>	
2007	32%	36.3%
	<b>3c. Performance Math - Grade 5 [843/2526]*100 = 33.4</b>	
2007	40%	33.4%
	<b>3c. Performance Math - Grade 6 [577/2479]*100 = 23.3</b>	
2007	40%	23.3%
	<b>3c. Performance Math - Grade 7 [538/2497]*100 = 21.5</b>	
2007	40%	21.5%
	<b>3c. Performance Math - Grade 8 [456/2441]*100 = 18.7</b>	
2007	33%	18.7%
	<b>3c. Performance Math - Grade 11 [271/2107]*100 = 12.9</b>	
2007	33%	12.9%

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007:**

The data presented this year (FFY2007) 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 125 districts that meet our definition for minimum "n" size. 115 of those LEAs 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 FFY2007 performance and compliance results. The FFY2007 statewide assessment data were disaggregated to the LEA level and presented as a part of the district performance profiles made public with Informational Letter # 51 ([http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=edu\\_letters&id=65681&v=article](http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=edu_letters&id=65681&v=article)) 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.

Data presented for participation and performance in this indicators are the same as reported in Table 6, submitted both as an attachment to this APR and separately to Westat on January 30, 2009. These data are validated during the initial reporting stages of the AYP process: counts of students are checked against the reported attending population on the tested date and confirmed by the Superintendent of the LEA; scores are confirmed by Measured Progress.

***OSEP status table, April 2009: The measurement for Indicator 3B requires States to report participation data by content area for each of the grades shown in Table 6 (grades 3-8 and a high school grade). Further, each State must include, in its SPP, targets against which the data for each of those grades can be compared (or a single target against which all of those grades can be compared).***

***The State provided participation data in Table 6 for all grades tested (grades 3-8 and 11), but has established targets against which only data for grades 4, 8, and 11 can be compared, and has not reported in Indicator 3B of the APR on the State's participation rates for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7.***

**New target values have been added to the charts above and below. 2007 data have been included for the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, and 7<sup>th</sup> grades. Minor corrections of data were made to match Table 6 in grade 4.**

## Grade Tested Participation to SPP Targets

Grade Tested	Participation Targets	FFY2007 Participation	
		Reading	Math
<b>Grade 3</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>98.9%</b>	<b>98.8%</b>
Grade 4	98%	<b>99.2%</b>	<b>99.0%</b>
<b>Grade 5</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>98.9%</b>	<b>98.9%</b>
<b>Grade 6</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>98.5%</b>	<b>98.4%</b>
<b>Grade 7</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>98.1%</b>	<b>97.7%</b>
Grade 8	98%	<b>98.0%</b>	<b>98.1%</b>
Grade 11	93%	<b>92.5%</b>	<b>95.7%</b>

Participation in the Math assessment met the target this year, **except in 7<sup>th</sup> grade**. Reading participation met the target in **3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>** and 8<sup>th</sup> grades, and improved in the 11th grade, but did not meet the target.

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 2007" table so that comparison of performance to targets could be made.

**OSEP status table, April 2009:** *The measurement for Indicator 3C requires States to report performance data by content area for each of the grades shown in Table 6 (grades 3-8 and a high school grade). Further, each State must include, in its SPP, targets against which the data for each of those grades can be compared (or a single target against which all of those grades can be compared).*

*The State provided performance data in Table 6 for all grades tested (grades 3-8 and 11), but has established targets against which only data for grades 4, 8, and 11 can be compared, and has not reported in Indicator 3C of the APR on the State's performance for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7.*

**New target values have been added to the charts above and below. 2007 data have been included for the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, and 7<sup>th</sup> grades.**

## Grade Tested Performance Targets FFY2007 Participation

Grade Tested	Performance Targets	FFY2007 Performance	Performance Targets	FFY2007 Performance
	Reading	Reading	Math	Math
<b>Grade 3</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>33.7%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>43.8%</b>
Grade 4	49%	<b>31.5%</b>	32%	<b>36.3%</b>

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>28.6%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>33.4%</b>
<b>Grade 6</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>33.7%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>23.3%</b>
<b>Grade 7</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>34.4%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>21.5%</b>
Grade 8	50%	<b>28.8%</b>	33%	<b>18.7%</b>
Grade 11	57%	<b>16.2%</b>	33%	<b>12.9%</b>

Math assessment performance in 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade met the target this year. Math assessment performance in the other grades did not meet targets, but did improve from FFY2006. Reading assessment performance improved in grades 8 and 11, but declined in grade 4.

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 2007" table so that comparison of performance to targets could be made.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007:**

Targets will not change, but Maine proposes the following improvement strategy additions for FFY2008 and beyond:

**Improvement Activities 2008-09**

Implement the integrated IDEA/NCLB accountability system.

History and discussion: Title IA works directly with school staff to review the participation and performance rates of all students (whole group and subgroups) which include students with IEPs. For schools experiencing challenges with participation rates, Title IA reviews current practices, provides technical assistance related to best practices, and works with the CIPS schools to create a plan for success. In order to help schools improve math and reading performance, Title IA starts by teaching staff how to conduct a review of annual assessment data, looking at gap analysis, and trends. Title IA then assists the school in conducting a needs assessment and to explore root causes for poor performance.

In the spring of 2008, the coordinator of Title IA CIPS schools, Rachelle Tome forwarded a request from the LEA superintendent with a CIPS high school to do a special education audit. The request was accepted by the Office of Special Services. Dr. Rosen from the Office of Special Services developed a team that included RMC Arlington VA, RMC Portsmouth NH, Ohio State University, and the Office of Special Services. This request

was an opportunity to actualize a vision held by the Office of Special Services (IDEA) and NCLB.

During this period, there was a vision emanating from the Director of NCLB, the Office of Title IA and Office of Special services personnel to combine IDEA/NCLB resources to develop a focused monitoring desk audit process supported by the Department's new data collection, reporting and communication system being created by Infinite Campus. Creating an IDEA/NCLB accountability system based on compatible data needs, e.g. graduation, dropout, assessment, suspension, expulsion was stimulated by the Council of Chief State School Officers' (CCSSO) document "Key Elements for Educational Accountability Models" which Jackie Soychak, Director of NCLB and Rachelle Tome, Coordinator of Title IA, had assisted in conceiving and developing as part of the Accountability Systems and Reporting State Collaborative (ASR) team led by Judy Park (Utah) and Kenneth Klau (MA).

In April 2008, the team introduced the phases of the review to the Administrative Team of the LEA. The review was to include the following phases: (1) initial analyses of district data in comparison to state baselines, averages, and/or targets to identify priority issues and foci; (2) negotiate priority areas for a focused review with district personnel; (3) conduct a week-long site visit that includes observations, interviews, focus groups, and classroom observations; (4) preliminary analysis of data from site visits; (5) sharing findings and engaging district stakeholders in root cause mapping process; and (6) final report and post-onsite activities that includes further improvement planning with support and assistance.

The Review focused on the key elements from the CCSSO's document. The Final Report delivered May 2008 made specific, strategic recommendations based on the key elements for improvement. These recommendations will be inserted into this LEA's Improvement/Corrective Action Plan in the spring of 2009.

At the fall 2008 NCLB conference, Dr. Pamela Rosen introduced a vision of an integrated IDEA/NCLB accountability system using examples of integration from the review described in the preceding paragraphs. This proposed system would provide a model for LEAs to imitate the collaborative essence of NCLB and IDEA. Although the need exists to continue the work towards Maine's IDEA/NCLB Accountability System, retirements of key personnel, reorganization of the Department and budgetary circumstances have delayed its development.

## **Improvement Activities 2009-10**

The LEA review conducted in April-May 2008 will be scaled up to meet the needs of LEAs (5) at the Need Intervention determination level.

Discussion: NCLB will provide a collaborative stance by providing data and, if there is a CIPS school in the LEA, provide technical assistance as described in the first paragraph under Improvement Activities 2008-09. NCLB has fewer personnel this year and cannot help the Office of Special Services (IDEA) staff the on-site review team.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007

### 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. ***[0/155]\*100 = 0***

The state also computes the percentage of rate of suspension/expulsion as [(#of children with disabilities suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days) / # of children with disabilities] \* 100. ***[(332)/ 34425] \* 100 = 0.97***

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.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy." ***[0/155]\*100 = 0***

#### Definition of Significant Discrepancy

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:

- 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).

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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	<i>Actual Target Data for 2007</i>
2007	<p>0% LEAs with significant discrepancies.</p> <p>1.70% suspension expulsion rate</p>	<p>0%</p> <p>0.97%</p>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007:**

Performance met the targets for this indicator. No LEA exceeded the limit for significant discrepancy for rates of suspension/expulsion overall, or by ethnicity. The rate of suspension/expulsion of students with disability continues below the target.

***OSEP status table, April 2009: OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, information related to the State’s 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 the LEA identified with a significant discrepancy in FFY 2005, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The State did not provide the required information regarding the district identified with a significant discrepancy in FFY 2005.***

**The LEA with a significant discrepancy in their rate of suspension and expulsion in FFY2005 was contacted by Maine Department of Education on January 5, 2009 to discuss and evaluate the circumstances of the data indication and to determine technical assistance requirements. The contact included a thorough assessment of the LEAs policies, procedures and practices regarding behavioral supports, procedural safeguards, and discipline. The LEA was found fully compliant with IDEA requirements. Additionally, data for 2005 were evaluated against previous and subsequent years to determine if any pattern of high incident rates were prevalent over time. The 2005-2006 school year data possessed a single incident that was unusual for the school involved, and uncharacteristic of normal discipline situations in the LEA’s history or in subsequent years. The unusually high rate of suspension in 2005 was found to be an isolated case of inappropriate group behavior that is unlikely to recur.**

OSEP response, June 6, 2008: In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, 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 the LEA identified with a significant discrepancy in FFY 2005, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

The Maine Department of Education Office of Special Services maintains an active affiliation with the Office of Substance Abuse (OSA) of the Maine Department of Health and Human Services. During the last two years, personnel from these offices have acted in concert by drafting Informational Letters for the Commissioner, presenting workshops for the LEAs and fielding their questions. Questions focused on the OSA/IDEA requirements, the need for integration, and additional data definitions necessitated by the integration. These actions accelerated the transition of data collection from the website to an integrated data collection and report system in Maine Education Data Management System (MEDMS)/Infinite Campus. Recent results (January 2009) indicate LEAs are responding with valid and reliable data.

OSA offered activities and they are listed by the following categories of the self assessment that will be used to further improvements for LEAs during 2009-10.

Behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS):

OSA provided financial and personnel support for “Prevention Works for Me! - 2nd Annual Maine Alliance to Prevent Substance Abuse -Prevention Convention, November 14, 2008”. Workshops:

- Know it’s Out there. How to find Resources, Data and Grants to Support your Prevention Program
- Creating School Policies
- Working with Law Enforcement
- Substance Abuse Prevention 101

Alternatives to suspension/expulsion:

SDFS regular grants to all Maine LEAs provide funds to Maine school districts for a variety of these types of programs (alternatives to suspensions/ expulsions, counseling, etc.).

Policy development on prevention or intervention that prevents suspension/expulsion:

OSA developed a new School Policy Guide: “Youth Substance Abuse Policy – A comprehensive Guide for Schools” Maine Office of Substance Abuse, May, 2008.  
<http://www.maine.gov/dhhs/osa/prevention/schoolcollege/policyguide.htm>

Assist LEAs analyze their data:

DOE Office of Management Information Systems has provided technical assistance through web training and training to school secretaries on how to submit their school incidence data; and OSA has provided workshops and manuals in the past on how to analyze and use incidence and prevalence data. Example: “The MYDAUS/YTS Guide – Maine Youth Drug and Alcohol use Survey and Youth Tobacco Survey”, Office of Substance Abuse, Maine DHHS, 2007”

SDFS regularly distributes through a list serve of local school district SDFS coordinators, prevention news information that includes notices of various workshops, conferences, training opportunities, etc. in all of these areas.

Improvement activities implemented this year were aligned with public dissemination of data and determination of LEAs based on the FFY2007 performance and compliance results. The FFY2007 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 # 51 ([http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=edu\\_letters&id=65681&v=article](http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=edu_letters&id=65681&v=article)) so that LEAs, parents and other interested parties could review LEA performance and take appropriate actions. The LEAs received direct mailing of additional copies of their data in a profile that included determinations of performance on critical performance measures and an overall determination level assignment. Determinations were a part of a LEA improvement process designed to promote improvement in specific SPP indicators accompanied by invitation to technical assistance and improvement planning provided by Maine Department of Education and its contractors.

Maine improved its collection for FFY2007 data as the collection was done using the Maine Education Data Management System (MEDMS) Infinite Campus implementation. Informational Letter # 49 ([http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=edu\\_letters&id=65460&v=article](http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=edu_letters&id=65460&v=article)) provided guidance for the collection data and described the requirements in detail. This collection simplifies the entry process by using the same mechanism for tracking disciplinary action as is used for all other student data collection. Data validations are incorporated into the Maine Education Data Management System (MEDMS)/Infinite Campus State Edition Behavior Module to ensure valid codes and student information are entered. On-line training and help-desk support were provided to all LEAs.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007:**

Targets will not change, but Maine proposes the following improvement strategy additions for FFY2008 and beyond:

Integrate data validation rules into the data input screens in Infinite campus to provide interactive feedback during data entry.

Each LEA with a determination of Needs Assistance or lower will be required to complete an in-depth self-assessment of this indicator available on the Maine Department of Education website at: [http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/spp\\_ta.html](http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/spp_ta.html)

Discussion: The CIMP includes a Self-assessment (Section 3) which is an in-depth self assessment of this indicator. This component has been developed by RMC Arlington VA by reviewing scientifically researched prototypes which have been formatted for Maine. (see Overview). By ranking six statements regarding General Discipline, Prevention, and Intervention Policies, five statements on the Collection, Analyses, and Uses of Discipline Data, five statements on the Implementation of Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and five statements on Alternatives to Suspension/Expulsion Policies, the LEA has developed its own rubric with a rating score and priority rank. The items for improvement are targeted and transferred to the Improvement/Corrective Action Plan were adapted for Maine by RMC Arlington VA from School-wide Positive Behavior Implementer's Blueprint and Self Assessment from the Center for Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (2004); Using Data for Decisions: What you can do to positively impact the disproportionate use of discipline by David Guardino (2007); and the Florida School Safety and Security Best Practices with Their Associated Indicators (2006-07).

The Office of Substance Abuse (OSA) of the Maine Department of Health and Human Services will be supporting technical assistance using the following opportunities:

1. OSA has recently awarded fifteen (15) grants (January, 2009) to agencies statewide as a result of two requests for proposals.
  - a. The Youth Substance Abuse Prevention Program was designed for the delivery of specific evidence-based programs throughout the state targeting 10-19 year olds.
  - b. The Student Intervention and Reintegration Program (SIRP) program targets at risk youth ages 15-18 (high school age). These projects are funded by the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant, from the U.S. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Substance Abuse Prevention.
2. OSA has funded through SDFS Governor's five (5) Grants to LEAs and community-based organizations, and other public entities and private organizations for services to children and youth who are not normally served by SEAs or LEAs; or populations that need special services or additional resources. Many of these include interventions and alternatives to suspension/expulsion.

3. Annual OSA Grantee Prevention Provider's Conference, November 13, 2009 Workshops:
  - a. *From Intervention to Treatment to Recovery*: How does prevention fit into each.
  - b. *Intervening and Diverting*: Learning about Diversion Programs in Maine
  - c. *Evaluation Planning Across the continuum*
  - d. *Fidelity and Adaptation*: How to adapt a strategy to meet the needs of the target group

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007

### 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))

<b>Measurement:</b>	
<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><b>[(18,088 regular class) ÷ (31,753 total)] times 100 = 57</b></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><b>[(3,647 resource room) ÷ (31,753 total)] times 100 = 11.5</b></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><b>[(1,127 other facility) ÷ (31,753 total)] times 100 = 3.5</b></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>

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	<i>Actual Target Data for 2007</i>
<b>5 A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day</b>		
<b>2007</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>57%</b>
<b>5B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day</b>		
<b>2007</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>11.5%</b>
<b>5C. Served in public or private separate schools</b>		
<b>2007</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>3.5%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007:**

The percentage of children served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements met the target. The percentage of children served in the regular classroom and the percentage of students served in self-contained placements did not meet targets.

Improvement activities implemented this year were aligned with public dissemination of data and determination of LEAs based on the FFY2006 performance and compliance results. The FFY2006 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 # 51 ([http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=edu\\_letters&id=65681&v=article](http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=edu_letters&id=65681&v=article)) so that LEAs, parents and other interested parties could review LEA performance and take appropriate actions. The LEAs received direct mailing of additional copies of their data in a profile that included determinations of performance on critical performance measures and an overall determinations level assignment. Determinations are part of a LEA improvement process designed to promote improvement in specific SPP indicators through technical assistance and improvement planning provided by Maine Department of Education and its contractors.

Overall determination levels presented on the determination profiles initiate specific actions as described in “Local Determinations Levels Assistance and Enforcement Actions”. Additionally, the individual determination of the performance on this indicator requires action by the LEA if the determination is Need Assistance or lower. The degree of action and extent of sanction increases as the determination worsens. LEAs with high performance levels on this indicator will be reviewed for promising practices transferrable to lower performing LEAs.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007:**

No revision of targets will be done this year. Changes in improvement strategies for FFY2008 and beyond:

Each LEA with a determination of Needs Assistance or lower will be required to complete an in-depth self-assessment of this indicator available on the Maine Department of Education website at: [http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/spp\\_ta.html](http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/spp_ta.html)

Discussion: The CIMP includes a Self-assessment (Section 3) which is an in-depth self assessment of this indicator (see Overview). This component has been developed by RMC Arlington VA by reviewing scientifically researched prototypes which have been formatted for Maine.

By ranking eight statements on District Leadership and Policies, six statements on Personnel Policies and three statements on Individualized Educational Program (IEP) Policies, the LEA has developed its own rubric with a rating score and priority rank. The items for improvement are targeted and transferred to the Improvement/Corrective Action Plan adapted by RMC Arlington VA from the California Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) District Self Assessment developed by Wested for California Department of Education (2007).

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007

### 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:**

Not required to report this indicator for FFY 2007.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	<i>Actual Target Data for 2007</i>
2007	84%	<i>Not Reported</i>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007:**

Not required to report this indicator for FFY 2007.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007:**

No revisions.

## 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.	<b>14 did not improve ÷ 71 assessed times 100 = 20</b>
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.	<b>11 improved little ÷ 71 assessed times 100 = 15</b>
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.	<b>12 improved nearer ÷ 71 assessed times 100 = 17</b>
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.	<b>12 improved same ÷ 71 assessed times 100 = 17</b>
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.	<b>22 maintained ÷ 71 assessed times 100 = 31</b>

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.	<b>16 did not improve ÷ 70 assessed times 100 = 23</b>
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.	<b>17 improved little ÷ 70 assessed times 100 = 24</b>
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.	<b>20 improved nearer ÷ 70 assessed times 100 = 29</b>
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.	<b>10 improved same ÷ 70 assessed times 100 = 14</b>
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.	<b>7 maintained ÷ 70 assessed times 100 = 10</b>

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 = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	<b>6 did not improve ÷ 71 assessed times 100 = 8</b>
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	<b>11 improved little ÷ 71 assessed times 100 = 15</b>

comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	
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.	<b>14 improved nearer ÷ 71 assessed times 100 = 20</b>
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.	<b>12 improved same ÷ 71 assessed times 100 = 17</b>
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.	<b>28 maintained ÷ 71 assessed times 100 = 39</b>

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

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

CDS has been involved in the use of the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) since 2005. In the initial use of the COSF 3 pilot sites were involved in the process. This group decided that the State would adopt the use of the ECO Center’s COSF. Training occurred for all sites by representatives from ECO and NECTAC in January of 2007. Effective April 1, 2007, Administrative Letter #2 required all sites to use the approved COSF.

Link to CDS Administrative Letters:

<http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/cds/adminlett.html>

The CDS State IEU provided training to all sites in November 2008 as follow up to the January 2007 training. Sites went away from the training with an increased knowledge of the COSF and the rating scale. Personnel has a much clear understanding of how to rate children on whether progress was made or not made. Along with the training the CDS State IEU, with assistance from the CDS field and representatives from, ECO and NECTAC, has updated the COSF form and has replaced Administrative Letter #2 with Administrative Letter #14. The guidelines provided to sites with Letter #2 have also been updated. Information from this training will be developed into a training module and will be placed on the CDS website for all sites to use with their staff. To ensure the COSF is completed correctly, forms will be reviewed and returned to sites directors and/or case managers for correction if information is missing. In addition to this monitoring, the new COSF has been formatted for electronic submission which will allow for better accuracy as the Office Assistant will not have to transcribe all COSFs being entered. The

B-5 Consultant for Intervention, Programming, and Staff Development will ensure that this process continues on its path of growth.

The outcome measure system for Maine includes:

- A. Policies and procedures to guide outcome assessment and measurement practices,
- B. Provision of training and technical assistance supports to administrators and service providers in outcome data collection, reporting, and use,
- C. Quality assurance and monitoring procedures to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the outcome data
- D. Data system elements for outcome data input and maintenance, and outcome data analysis functions,
- E. Measurement strategies used to collect data,
- F. The criteria used to determine whether a child's functioning was "comparable to same aged peers".

Each of these elements is described below:

**A. Policies and procedures to guide outcome assessment and measurement practices:**

Maine's Child Development Services (CDS) is a birth-5 system. The population of children for whom outcome data is collected includes all children with IFSPs/IEPs ages birth-5.

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 has reviewed various early childhood assessment systems and has created a list of acceptable assessments for children aged 3-5. In FFY08 CDS State IEU, MDOE and Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities will hold regional conferences for CDS Sites, providers and PreK- 3 Public School Educators and Administrators. As part of this conference acceptable assessments will be discussed.

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 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).

The case manager is responsible for collecting enough information to determine the early childhood outcome ratings for the child (on a scale of 1-7 on the child outcomes summary form) and the IEP team will review the existing data on the child at the IEP meeting. The information gathered at the IEP includes evaluations and assessments, information provided by the parents of the child, and observations by caregivers and other 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 IEP or at transition from Part B 619 to Kindergarten. Assessments will also be administered to all children exiting the system who have received services for at least six months.

**B. Provision of training and technical assistance supports to administrators and service providers in outcome data collection, reporting, and use:**

In November 17 and 18, 2008 training with Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) and the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC) was held centrally for all 16 CDS Sites. This training was held in follow up to COSF training that was held in January 2007 with the same presenters. As part of the 2008 training each of the 16 CDS Sites sent a team of staff to day one of the training for intensive work on child outcomes and how progress/ ratings are determined. Day one focused on reviewing why we collect data outcomes, understanding implementation issues and strategies, reviewing the use of the 7- point rating scale, understanding quality indicators for implementation and understanding of how data will be reported and used. Attendance on day two consisted of CDS site directors and at least one veteran representative from each site. Training on the second day focused on understanding how to look at outcomes data, making inferences and strategizing actions, understanding the importance of data quality, understanding strategies for assuring data quality and devising action steps for helping programs improve child outcomes data quality. The afternoon was spent discussing what currently occurred at each site, what questions were still unanswered and how to make the process work more efficiently and productively throughout the state. A committee was developed to review the current COSF form used by Maine and the guidance provided to all sites. As a result of this committee CDS State IEU has issued Administrative Letter #14 (replacement for Administrative Letter #2: CDS Procedures for Measuring Child Outcomes, issued on March 15, 2007). Included with Administrative Letter #14 is the revised CDS State IEU developed COSF form and guidelines. Recommendations from the field of CDS Staff and support of the ECO/NECTAC representatives were included in all revisions. Included in the guidelines is a document on childhood developmental milestones and the ECO decision tree. This document was developed to assist teams while in meetings to determine an accurate rating. As the training concluded the presenters from ECO/ NECTAC (who previously provided training and technical assistance to the state) commented on the noticeable change in the regional site staff attitude and willingness to learn and adopt new ideas and change.

Continued technical assistance will occur through monitoring, training resources available on CDS website as well as information and resources provided by ECO. The B-5 Consultant for Intervention, Programming, and Staff Development will continue conversations with site directors and staff regarding the needs, barriers and success to the updated process required by Letter #14. The Office Assistant will review all COSFs as they are entered into the data base and inform the B-5 Consultant regularly on the status of the incoming COSFs and the common concerns and best practices gathered to ensure sites receive continuous technical assistance.

Models of best practice will be determined and disseminated to sites for assistance and guidance.

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

The CDS State IEU monitoring process of each site includes a review of outcome information in the files. Information is also reviewed by Office Assistant when entered into the data base. Error checks are built into the State data system.

A small group of site directors have created an internal monitoring and review process of all COSF's prior to being sent to CDS State IEU for entry into the state data base.

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

Data continues to be collected, entered and analyzed by the CDS State IEU. The Office Assistant enters COSF forms submitted to the central office into a central database. At the latest training sites were encouraged to submit via e-mail COSF forms completed in a standardized MS Word form. These forms can be exported to a file and then imported into the central database. It saves time and helps eliminate some of the human error that occurs when data are redone by hand. This is an interim method being used while a web based system is developed. The entire CDS Case-e data system continues to evolve and will one day include the COSF.

The Time 1 and Time 2 ratings for the indicator have always come from the data system. Reports based on the data can be produced for other purposes by site or by child and or site.

**E. Measurement strategies used to collect data:**

All children with IFSPs/IEPs throughout each of the 16 sites are included in this measurement.

Information from a variety of sources is used to rate the three outcome areas. This information is obtained from the family, informed clinical judgment, approved assessments, and observations of the child in their least restrictive environment. Administrative Letter #2 required COSF commencing April 2007, Administrative Letter # 14 replaces Administrative Letter #2 and requires use of updated form approved by CDS State IEU. The case manager will be responsible for collecting the information necessary, completing the COSF form and submitting the form to the State CDS IEU Office Assistant for entry into the data base. At the November 2008 training for Site Staff Teams it was discussed that the form should be completed at the child's IFSP/IEP meeting with the IFSP/IEP team or directly following the meeting. The rating will be based on information that is available at that meeting.

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 sufficiently 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 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) by site as well as by state.

**F. The criteria used to determine whether a child's functioning was "comparable to same aged peers".**

Since Maine is using the COSF, the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" is a rating of 6 or 7 on the scale. In addition sites use information gathered through variety of sources and evaluation/ assessments to determine child's functioning. Sites have also received guidance and resources on childhood developmental milestones to assist and to help lead conversations during child's IFSP/ IEP meetings with CDS Administrative Letter # 14.

**Baseline Data:**

These are NOT baseline data, as targets are not due for this indicator until February 2010. Progress data for FFY 2007 are reported below.

**Progress Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):**

OSEP response, June 6, 2008: The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.

For Part B, 120 children aged 3-5 were assessed. Of these, 71 indicated a "y" or "n" with regard to Outcome 1 (Positive social-emotional skills) as to whether the child made progress from the first to the second assessment, 70 indicated a "y" or "n" for Outcome 2 (Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills), and 71 indicated a "y" or "n" for Outcome 3 (Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs).

<b>FFY 2007</b>	<b>Progress Data for FFY 2007</b>		
	<b>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):</b>	<b>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills:</b>	<b>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:</b>
<i>did not improve functioning</i>	<b>20%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<i>improved functioning but not nearer</i>	<b>15%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>15%</b>
<i>improved functioning to a level nearer</i>	<b>17%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>20%</b>
<i>improved functioning to comparable</i>	<b>17%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<i>maintained functioning</i>	<b>31%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>39%</b>

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

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Baseline data and targets to be provided in the FFY 2008 APR, due to be submitted February 1, 2010.

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Measurable and Rigorous Target</b>
<b>2005 (2005-2006)</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>n/a</b>

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Measurable and Rigorous Target</b>
<b>(2006-2007)</b>	
<b>2007 (2007-2008)</b>	<b>Progress data.</b>
<b>2008 (2008-2009)</b>	<b>Baseline data and targets to be provided</b>
<b>2009 (2009-2010)</b>	<b>Target value to be set in the FFY 2008 APR</b>
<b>2010 (2010-2011)</b>	<b>Target value to be set in the FFY 2008 APR</b>

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources	Status
	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	Completed
Training conducted January 2007 on Child Outcomes Summary Form		X					MDOE	Completed
Small group review of instruments to use with Part B children. Mandate throughout CDS system			X				CDS sites	Completed
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	Continue

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources	Status
	FFY Year when activities will occur							
	05	06	07	08	09	10		
Continuing assessment of the data collection system			X	X	X	X	MDOE	Continue
Continuing training and professional development			X	X	X	X	MDOE	Continue
<b>Work plan for core subcommittee:</b> January –March 2007 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Determine common assessment tools used at the site level (done)</li> <li>➤ 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.</li> <li>➤ 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</li> <li>➤ 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</li> <li>➤ Revise Maine’s data system and develop monitoring system accordingly</li> <li>➤ Revise training plan and implement system-wide.</li> </ul>		X	X				Sub-Committee	Completed
Quality checks will be performed as COSF data is entered into database				X	X			

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources	Status
	FFY Year when activities will occur							
	05	06	07	08	09	10		
All COSFs will be submitted electronically				X	X	X		
Activities of best practice will be distributed to all sites				X	X	X		
Outcome ratings will be monitored				X				

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007

### 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. ***[(2111)/2381] \* 100 = 89***

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	<i>Actual Target Data for 2007</i>
2007	87%	<b><i>89%</i></b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007:**

The percentage of parents with a child receiving special education services who reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities met the target. The data were provided to the LEAs in their profiles for consideration by the LEA. A determination value was applied to LEA performance against this measure, but it was not included in the calculations of overall determination. The data will be reviewed with the LEA during program review where a decision on required action will be made.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007:**

No revision of targets will be done this year. Add improvement strategy for FFY2008 and beyond:

Contract a parent organization to sustain survey data collection.

Discussion: Maine will contract with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) for the 2009-2010 and subsequent school years due to a lack of sufficient resources within MDOE. MPF will contact the Child Development Services State Office and LEAs specified by the Department to obtain parent contact information. They will prepare three types of surveys (Part C - birth to 2, Part B 619 for ages 3-5, and Part B school age 5-20) along with a cover letter for DOE approval and signature. They will be responsible for printing the surveys and cover letters and preparing and stuffing envelopes in preparation for mailing. Surveys will be mailed first class mail to parents of students with disabilities to LEAs and CDS sites specified by the department (approximately 13,000). Returned surveys will be forwarded by MPF when possible. MPF will track the number of surveys sent by LEA and CDS site, the number returned with forwarding addresses, the number returned without forwarding addresses, and the number of surveys completed. They will also electronically capture the data from each of the three instruments in a format specified by the Department. After the initial administration, MPF will review the strengths and weaknesses of survey administration process with the Department and make recommendations to the Department for improving the process of survey administration. MPF will then update parent survey administration protocols as agreed upon with the Department.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007

### 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 as the result of inappropriate identification) ÷ (155 LEAs)] 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 representation three times the standard deviation estimate higher or lower than the LEA proportion 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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	<i>Actual Target Data for 2007</i>
<b>2007</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007:**

Compliance met the target for this indicator.

**OSEP status table, April 2009:** The State reported that 153 districts exhibited ethnic representation in special education that was within statistical limits defined for significant disproportionality. The State must clarify whether it is referring to significant disproportionality or disproportionate representation.

**The state reference to “significant disproportionality” was incorrect. The wording in the paragraph below has been corrected.**

All 155 LEAs in the state were analyzed for disproportionate representation. Two LEAs have total populations of less than 10 students, all Caucasian, so they were not reviewed further. The remaining 153 exhibit ethnic representation in special education that are within statistical limits defined for **disproportionate representation**.

Maine’s examination of disproportionate representation includes 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 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.

Reporting year	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
<b>FFY2007</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

LEA profiles used as the basis for determination include a compliance measure for disproportionate representation in special education identification and related services. For the purposes of determination, non-compliance with this (or any compliance indicator) results in a maximum overall determination of Needs Assistance.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007:**

No revisions.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007

### 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) ÷ (155 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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Actual Target Data for 2007
2007	0%	0%

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007:**

Compliance met the target for this indicator.

OSEP response, June 6, 2008: However, the State did not submit valid and reliable data because the State reported the “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.” The State must provide valid and reliable FFY 2005 baseline data and FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 progress data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.

Disproportionate representation in specific disability calculations were redone for all previous years of the SPP. Baseline data for FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 progress data are shown in the table below. Analysis of Means calculation was applied to the districts in Maine with greater than 10 students in any ethnic group for each disability; this includes all five ethnic groups (American Indian, Asian, Black, Caucasian, and Hispanic) for each disability.

Table: Valid and reliable data for FFY 2005 through FFY 2007

Data	Number of LEAs with more than 10 students in <u>any</u> ethnic group in a specific disability category	Number of LEAs exhibiting disproportionate representation in specific disability categories	Number of LEAs exhibiting disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification
FFY 2005 Baseline	2	0	0
FFY 2006 Progress	3	1	0
<b>FFY 2007 Progress</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

*Recalculation*

For FFY2007, three LEAs in the state meet the minimum population requirements; one LEA in six specific disabilities (Autism, Emotional Disabilities, Multiple Disabilities, Other Health Impairment, Specific Learning Disability, and Speech and Language Impairment), the other two only in one disability (Speech and Language Impairment). Population values in all other disabilities fail to meet the minimum population requirements. No LEAs show possible disproportionate representation of students in specific disabilities (Multiple Disabilities, Other Health Impairment, Specific Learning Disability, and Speech and Language Impairment). No LEAs exhibit disproportionate representation that is statistically significant; therefore, none are a result of inappropriate identification.

LEA profiles used as the basis for determination include a compliance measure for disproportionate representation in specific disability categories. For the purposes of determination, non-compliance with this (or any compliance indicator) results in a maximum overall determination of Needs Assistance.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007:**

No revisions.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007

### 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))

**Measurement:**

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).
- c. # determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).

**Percent = [(b + c) divided by (a)] times 100 = [(370 + 20221) ÷ 21776] times 100 = 98.6**

There are no children included in a. that are not included in either b. or c.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	<i>Actual Target Data for 2007</i>
<b>2007</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>94.6%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007:**

This measure did not meet the 100% compliance target, but improved from last year and previous years. Regional presentations of the LEA performance profiles and the CDS site profiles were made by the Maine Department of Education to Special Education and Site Directors highlighting compliance indicators as a key factor in determination for FFY 2006. Technical assistance provided to the LEAs and CDS sites has improved focus on critical aspects of the development and maintenance of IEP documentation and implementation of the required evaluations.

OSEP response, June 6, 2008: The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.

The number of findings for FFY2007 is shown below. Some of the findings have been closed, but verification of others is still in progress. During on-site monitoring reviews in the 2007-2008 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:

Monitoring in FFY 2007	FFY 2007 (July 2007 - June 2008)		
Indicator 11 Findings	# of LEAs with findings	# of LEAs reviewed	# of LEAs compliant
Number of CDS sites (preschool)	13	16	3
Number of LEAs (school aged)	1	23	22

OSEP response, June 6, 2008: In the FFY 2007 APR, in responding to Indicators 11 and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.

Timeline compliance for both preschool and school aged children is determined through review of IEP records during program monitoring. The data on findings indicates EIS/LEA level notification and responsibility, but the data for calculation of the indicator compliance are compiled from individual records reviewed during the on-site program review. Details of the review activities, findings of non-compliance, treatment of the findings and the status of correction are discussed below.

### Section I - Part B 619 (Ages 3 through 5)

The state continues to struggle with the complexities of the historical practice of contracting with private providers to complete initial evaluations for children referred to CDS. When sites contract with providers to complete initial evaluations they have limited control over the providers' schedules and their ability to complete the evaluation within the 60 day time limit. When sites employ their own providers and create multi disciplinary evaluation teams within their sites, compliance is achieved because the site has direct supervision of the evaluators. Data was presented to MACECD in December of 2008 comparing sites that hire their own providers to complete the initial evaluations versus the sites that use contracted providers. This data was then compared to the sites overall compliance with Indicator B11. The data was reviewed by the Advisory Board and it led to the Advisory Board recommending in December of 2008 that, "The CDS sites employ providers rather than contract services for the purposes of evaluation. Expected impact of implementation of recommendations: All CDS sites will be in compliance for evaluations."

Over the course of the FFY2007 year, On-site Monitoring was completed. The CDS State IEU will address the areas of non-compliance for Indicator B11 from 2005 in the FFY2007 APR Indicator B15 section.

<b>Correction of Non-Compliance for Indicator B11</b>					
The CDS State IEU grouped individual instances of noncompliance by legal requirement and CDS site to make findings related to this indicator. To verify correction, subsequent data will be reviewed. In addition, The CDS State IEU required follow-up on each individual instance of noncompliance to ensure that services, when not provided timely, were in fact provided.					
<b>Year of Findings</b>	<b>Total Findings of Non-Compliance with Indicator B11</b>	<b>Findings verified as Corrected within One Year</b>	<b>Findings Subsequently Verified as Corrected</b>	<b>Total Findings Corrected as of Submission</b>	<b>Findings of Non-Compliance Remaining</b>
FFY 2007	<b>13*</b>				<b>13</b>
FFY 2006	There were no findings of non-compliance issued for indicator B11 during the FFY 06 Year				
FFY 2005	<b>14</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>

\* The one-year timeline for all of these findings has not yet expired.

The thirteen sites issued findings of non-compliance in FFY 07 will be reviewed for their second year of monitoring during the FFY 08 year to measure progress in correcting non-compliance identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2007.

Improvement Activities:

- Weekly “super user” webinars have been in place since the fall of 2008. The webinars are interactive and allow for dialogs among State and site personnel on a regular basis.
- Compliance timelines are stressed to personnel charged with monitoring data at the site level (super users).
- Super users are usually, but not necessarily, data coordinators at the site and there is often more than one super user at a site. The second super user is usually a case manager. Whether or not a super user is directly involved in the process that aligns children with providers they are important links in the communication process that enable other personnel at the site to understand the importance of their work in relation to children and our system.
- Specific mention of the need for compliance with existing timelines occurs frequently in 1-on-1 conversations between the State data coordinator and site data super users.
- State data system reports allow the State to monitor service status periodically the system also has reports that focus on timeline compliance. Again, the sites continue to be required to submit monthly compliance reports.
- Many sites supplement reports run from the data system with their own lists. This is good practice because it involves the site in the process to a greater extent than just passing on a system report. It also means that there is interaction among site personnel involved in the data gathering and case management. The interaction reinforces the importance of timeline

compliance and allows each group to inform the other about obstacles, needs and strategies for change.

- The State CDS IEU has provided compliance training which is on-site training which addresses the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations and OSEP Performance and Compliance Indicators, to all of our sites. During the training, the CDS State IEU consultant reviews the regulations and works with the staff from the regional sites towards achieving compliance. Specific training focuses on the use of Written Notice, Timeline compliance, service settings including the Natural Environment and the Least Restrictive Environment and timely Delivery of services to the children and families being served by the site. All Sites receive a minimum of three hours training as part of the Year One and Year Two On-Site Monitoring process to start the site's internal audit and self-assessment.
- The State CDS IEU Lunch and Learns have been a successful method of relaying information to the sites. As mentioned in other indicators, they are utilized to provide clarifying information on a variety of issues that have been noted through monitoring as well as part of the State CDS IEU's clarification of the part C federal regulations and the state regulations.
- "Oh Those State Required Forms" – MDOE and CDS regional trainings were held in September and October of 2008. These trainings were held for SAU personnel B-20 on changes in the state required special education forms.

## Section II - Part B School Aged (6 to 20)

During the focused monitoring visits in FFY 2007, one LEA was found non-compliant to the 60-day timeline requirement. The reason for delay in meeting the 60 calendar day timeline (In Maine for the 07-08 data we were under the established timeline of 45 school days) was due to a lack of qualified evaluator in the local area of the LEA. A letter of findings was delivered to the LEA on November 20, 2007. LEA was required to provide specific response within 90 days, which they provided on time.

***OSEP status table, April 2009: The State did not indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays for children who were not evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for the evaluation.***

**The LEA completed the evaluation 56 school days from the date consent to evaluate was given. The delay was caused difficulty in scheduling a qualified evaluator to visit the remote location of the LEA. As a part of their corrective action response, the LEA has contracted with another evaluator who will be able to respond to their needs more quickly.**

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007:**

No revisions.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007

### 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))

<b>Measurement:</b>	
a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination	<b>1190</b>
b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays	<b>0</b>
c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	<b>1182</b>
d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services	<b>8</b>
<p>Account for children included in a but not included in b, c or d. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.</p> <p>Percent = [(c) divided by (a – b - d)] times 100 = <b>[1182 ÷ (1190– 0 – 8)] times 100 = 100</b></p>	

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Measurable and Rigorous Target</b>	<b>Actual Target Data for 2007</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007:**

This measure met the target. Children transitioning from Part C services to Part B 619 are served within the Child Development Services (CDS) sites throughout the state. CDS has conducted extensive training during the FFY 07 year on the Transition requirements for children transitioning from Part C to Part B 619.

Maine established a timeline for sites to follow to help achieve compliance for the Transition from Part C to Part B of IDEA and to ensure 100% compliance with indicator B12. The timeline is outlined as follows:

**Between the ages of 2.3 years to 2.6 years of a child receiving Part C services:**

**Begin Transition Planning with the Family**

- Document planning steps and services offered to the family on IFSP
- Discuss with parents what “transition” from early intervention to Part B Preschool Special Education services means. Including eligibility and age guidelines for Preschool Special Education
- The differences between Early Intervention and Preschool Special Education (Free and Appropriate Public Education)
- The difference between and IFSP and an IEP
- Services provided in the natural environment vs. in the least restrictive environment
- Review child’s present level of functioning and most recent evaluations. Determine what, if any evaluations need to be completed to determine eligibility for Preschool Special Education services
- With parental consent, pass on information (including evaluation and assessments and the IFSP) to Part B personnel.
- Discuss with parents possible program options that may be available when their child is no longer eligible for early intervention services
- Provide opportunity for parents to meet and receive information from pre-school or other community program representatives as appropriate.
- Schedule the transition conference and invite participants.

No later than 2.9 years old:

**Transition Conference**

- Must be held no later than 90 days before the child’s third birthday
- Team must determine if the child is eligible to receive Part B services
- IEP may be developed at the transition conference but must be developed no later than 15 days before the child’s third birthday.
- If the child is eligible for Part B services, Consent for placement is signed by the parent
- Determination of the Least Restrictive Preschool Placement for the child

Between the ages of 2.9 years and 3 yrs old:

**If the child is found eligible for Part B services:**

- If the IEP was not developed at the Transition Conference, schedule an IEP Team meeting to develop the child’s IEP no later than 15 days before the child turns 3.
- The site must determine the location in which the child’s special education services will be provided in order to provide a FAPE

- Provide transition services and opportunities for the child and family to visit the program

**If the child was not found eligible for Part B services:**

- Early Intervention Services as outlined in the child's IFSP will continue until the child turns 3.
- Provide information about programs or services that may be available to them once their Part C services end.

Child's 3<sup>rd</sup> Birthday:

**Upon the child's third birthday the site must ensure that:**

- The child has an IEP outlining his/her Part B Preschool Special Education services
- Early Intervention services have ended
- Determine if a post transition IEP team meeting needs to be held to evaluate the process with families.

That means that all children who have been found eligible for Part B 619 services have implemented IEPs at transition. Eight children not accounted for left the system due to family decision.

CDS state personnel continue to monitor sites for compliance and verify data and data entry. They continue to provide ongoing professional development and trainings to enhance understanding and compliance.

**Improvement Activities**

- Training occurred during each individual site during the on-site monitoring visits.
- A state wide training was held in October of 2007 at the Maine Administrators Of Special Education (MADSEC) Fall Conference utilizing a PowerPoint presentation [Part C to B Transition Presentation](#) and group discussions. The CDS site directors and staff were able to share ideas and or processes for implementation to track and meet the Transition requirements of Indicator 8A.
- In January of 2008, two trainings were provided by the CDS State IEU for state wide service providers on the requirements of MUSER (Maine Unified Special Education Regulations), Chapter 101 including the requirements of Indicator 8.
- In April 2008, two trainings were provided by the CDS State IEU and Maine Parent Federation for parents of children receiving services by the Child Development Services sites across the state on MUSER, Chapter 101 including the transition requirements of Indicator 8.
- Over the course of the FFY 2007 year, weekly "Lunch and Learn" telephone conference calls were conducted by the State CDS Director, the Assistant Attorney General for Education and CDS consultants addressing all areas of compliance with state and federal

regulations. Sites were notified of the trainings via email and all sites were invited to participate.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007:**

No revisions.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007

### 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.

**[6692/7024] X 100 = 95.3%**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	<i>Actual Target Data for 2007</i>
<b>2007</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>95.3%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007:**

This measure did not meet the 100% compliance target, but improved significantly this year. Regional presentations of the LEA performance profiles and the CDS site profiles were made by the Maine Department of Education to Special Education and Site Directors highlighting compliance indicators as a key factor in determination for FFY 2006. Technical assistance provided to the LEAs and CDS sites has improved focus on critical aspects of the development and maintenance of IEP documentation and implementation of the required evaluations. Additionally, Maine Transition Network continues to provide professional development to school staff developing transition goals in IEP documentation to ensure that measurable goals and services are included in IEPs for children age 16 and older.

The program review team uses a question on the Pupil Record Audit Form focused monitoring to capture data on the assessment of the number of youth with disabilities aged 16 and older 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. The audit evaluates records

reviewed for appropriate measurable post-secondary goals based upon age-appropriate transition assessments related to training, education, employment, and where appropriate, independent living skills. Compliance with the requirement is required. Non-compliance detected is documented in the post-audit letter to the LEA as a finding that must be corrected within 12 months. Four findings of non-compliance were reported for the 2007-2008 school year reviews.

OSEP response, June 6, 2008: In the FFY 2007 APR, in responding to Indicators 11 and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.

OSEP response, June 6, 2008: The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.

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 corrective action response by a specific date, in no case beyond 90 days. Fifteen of the eighteen LEAs corrected the non-compliance discovered within twelve months. The remaining three required follow-up corrections when the evidence of corrective action was found insufficient for compliance; non-compliance was corrected in each of the three fourteen months from the date of initial finding letter. In order to promote continuation of compliance, determinations of LEAs for FFY2006 included compliance indicators B-11 and B-13 on the data profiles sent to Superintendents. Self-assessment and technical assistance activities will focus on non-compliance with these indicators as key factors in performance improvement.

The program review team reviewed the improvement activities as well as the Pupil Record Audit Form, data collection, and technical assistance procedures. The activities performed in FFY2007 improved data quality, responsiveness in the correction of non-compliance, and provided appropriate and timely technical assistance to LEAs across the state.

Maine Transition Network<sup>1</sup> (MTN) is working collaboratively with the Program Review team to identify LEAs with demonstrated challenges in developing coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals. MTN has increased the number of schools and LEAs participating in Transition Outcomes Project (TOPs) significantly, and has focused those efforts on LEAs identified during self-assessment as requiring assistance. MTN's success with the TOPs program is apparent in the improvement (reduction) in findings of non-compliance for transition elements of the pupil record audit during the monitoring visit to the LEAs involved in the TOPs program and its associated technical assistance.

---

<sup>1</sup> Maine Transition Network is funded, in part, by the Maine Department of Education

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007:**

No revision of targets will be done this year. Changes in improvement strategies for FFY2008 and beyond:

Each LEA with a determination of Needs Assistance or lower will be required to complete an in-depth self-assessment of this indicator available on the Maine Department of Education website at: [http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/spp\\_ta.html](http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/spp_ta.html)

Discussion: The CIMP includes a Self-assessment (Section 3) which is an in-depth self assessment of this indicator (see Overview). This component has been developed by RMC Arlington VA by reviewing scientifically researched prototypes which have been formatted for Maine.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007  
**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

**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 the (# of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school)] times 100.

Of 94 responding, 72 youth no longer in secondary school who were competitively employed **(40)**, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school **(15)**, or both **(17)**.  **$(72 / 94) * 100 = 77\%$**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	<i>Actual Target Data for 2007</i>
<b>2007</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>77%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007:**

This measure did not meet the target, but the extent of the slippage is not statistically significant. The population represented is 319 graduating students; 94 responded. Normal variation expected in a population of that size is larger than the difference between the target and the actual performance. However, the data were provided to the LEAs in their profiles for consideration by the LEA. A determination value was applied to LEA performance against this measure, but it was not included in the calculations of overall determination. The data will be reviewed with the LEA during program review where a decision on required action will be made.

The National Post-School Outcomes (NPSO) worksheet of the survey results is shown below. The proportions in the subgroups defined are representative of the student proportions in the LEAs surveyed.

<b>Maine: 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. 2007-2008 Respondent Data</b>	
The minimum cohort size that is reported to protect the identity of small groups of students is:	0
Competitive employment means work-(i) In the competitive labor market that is performed on a full-time or part-time basis in an integrated setting; and (ii) For which an individual is compensated at or above the minimum wage, but not less than the customary wage and level of benefits paid by the employer for the same or similar work performed by individuals who are not disabled. (Sections 7(11) and 12(c) of the Rehab Act; 29 U.S.C. 705(11) and 709(c))	
Post-Secondary School is defined as:	

<b>Statewide Response Rate</b>	<b>29%</b>
--------------------------------	------------

<b>Respondents by Gender</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>%</b>
Female	31	33%
Male	63	67%
Unknown: Gender	0	0%
	94	100%

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Count</b>
2007 prog rev Respondents	94

<b>Respondents by Ethnicity</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Respondents by Exit Type</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>%</b>
White	90	96%	High School Diploma	63	67%
Hispanic	1	1%	Certificate or Modified Diploma	14	15%
Black	2	2%	Aged out (maximum age)	0	0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	1%	Dropout	17	18%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0%	Unknown: Exit Reason	0	0%
Unknown/Other Ethnicity	0	0%		94	100%
	94	100%			

<b>Respondents by Type of Disability</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Respondents by Type of Disability</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>%</b>
Specific Learning Disability	37	39%	Specific Learning Disability	37	39%
Emotional Disturbance	18	19%	Emotional Disturbance	18	19%
Mental Retardation	3	3%	Mental Retardation	3	3%
Other Health Impairment	12	13%	All Other Disabilities	36	38%
Multiple Disabilities	6	6%	Unknown: Disability Type	0	0%
Speech or Language Impairment	11	12%		94	100%
Autism	4	4%			
Hearing Impairments	0	0%			
Traumatic Brain Injury	2	2%			
Orthopedic Impairment	0	0%			
Visual Impairment including blindness	0	0%			
Deafness	1	1%			
Deaf-Blindness	0	0%			
Unknown: Disability Type	0	0%			
	94	100%			

**OSEP status table, April 2009:** In its description of its FFY 2007 data, the State did not adequately address whether the response group was representative of the population. While the State reported percentages of respondents by ethnicity, type of disability, gender, and exit type, the State neither included any demographic data with which to compare the response percentages, nor provided any analysis or conclusion as to the representiveness of the respondents.

The analysis of respondent representation is shown below in chart form. Only classroom placement (LRE) and disability type were sufficiently large in the sample to provide comparison with the population at large. Placement percentages are very representative between the survey group and the population in the surveyed LEAs. The sample contained a slightly high percentage of Specific Learning Disability students than was present in the population overall, but the values are within the statistical range of variation possible for the sample population.

	data from 2006 profile			data from EF-S-05 online database ( <a href="http://portalx.bisoex.state.me.us/pls/doe/eddev.efs05_public_reports.select_unit?v_source=exceptionality">http://portalx.bisoex.state.me.us/pls/doe/eddev.efs05_public_reports.select_unit?v_source=exceptionality</a> ) for 2006-2007								
5951 total LEA Special Education population represented by the sample	LEA Placement			LEA Disability								
	80% or more	40% or less	OOD	LD	ED	OHI	SLI	MD	Autis m	MR	TBI	Deaf
LEA counts	2937	914	234	1717	705	948	1447	551	271	187	18	35
<b>Comparison Percentage</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>
Response Group (n)	45	14	3	37	18	12	11	6	4	3	2	1
<b>Response Group (%)</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1%</b>
Upper limit	72%			53%								
Lower limit	27%			5%								

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007:**

No revision of targets will be done this year. Changes in improvement strategies for FFY2008 and beyond:

Each LEA with a determination of Needs Assistance or lower will be required to complete an in-depth self-assessment of this indicator available on the Maine Department of Education website at: [http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/spp\\_ta.html](http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/spp_ta.html)

Discussion: The CIMP includes a Self-assessment (Section 3) which is an in-depth self assessment of this indicator (see Overview). This component has been developed by RMC Arlington VA by reviewing scientifically researched prototypes which have been formatted for Maine.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

### 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 = **[37/40] X 100 = 92.5**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Actual Target Data for 2007
2007	100%	92.5%

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007:**

Enter progress and slippage.

OSEP response, June 6, 2008: The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005.

#### Part B 619 (Ages 3 through 5)

Maine’s Child Development Services is in its third year of significant restructuring. As with all change, pieces start to fall into place as the years progress. The conversion of many facets of the system from the 16 Regional Sites to the CDS State IEU are completed or significantly underway. New personnel have been added at the CDS State IEU and there is now a management team in place to address fiscal, data, HR and policy issues and a separate policy team to address the SPP. The CDS State IEU policy team consists of the Data Specialist, the B-5 Consultant for Monitoring and Technical Assistance, and the B-5 Consultant for Intervention, Programming, and Staff Development, and the State Director (Part C /Section 619

Coordinator). The Policy team focused this past year on the performance of the regional sites on the Part C SPP indicators and the structure of the support we can offer them through a general supervision system. The team met frequently and studied the sources of information and data that are available to describe the performance of the system and what those sources were indicating.

The CDS State IEU, with technical assistance from NERRC, a General Supervision System (GSST) that references the general supervision system "Big 8" developed by OSEP. The system includes a monitoring component. In the FFY2006 APR the State IEU indicated a Monitoring Manual would be developed for completion by June of 2008. Since the FFY2006 APR it became clear to the State IEU Director that the General Supervision System needed to be established with all aspects of monitoring the work of the 16 regional sites included within the structure of the overall system. The CDS State IEU is now in the process of developing, organizing, and piloting the system components and all accompanying documents for utilization by regional teams as of July 1, 2009. The CDS State IEU has shared this system with the CDS State Level Advisory Board on a monthly basis since September through presentations by the State Director, the assistant Attorney General for Education and Larry Ringer from OSEP. Additionally, the State Director presented to the Maine Advisory Council (MACECD), all site directors, and staff representatives who attended the Child Outcomes Summary Form Training Session. [Informational Letter #2](#) was sent out including power point presentation as a hyperlink. Additional information has been provided at the weekly Lunch and Learns hosted by the assistant attorney general for education. The CDS State IEU has worked closely with the MDOE 5-20 system to assure that there is consistency in the B-20 determination responses.

The CDS State IEU has monitored each of the 16 regional sites annually the past two years which has prepared the CDS State IEU to be well positioned to start the response to determination portion of the GSST system July 1, 2009. The CDS state level Advisory Board has made a decision to focus on one SPP indicator at each meeting. This will provide assurance that there is knowledge at the management level to support each site in their efforts to reach targets. The CDS State IEU has made it clear to the regional sites that noncompliance is not acceptable. There is a growing acknowledgement at the staff, site director, and board management level that this is a serious undertaking and profile indicators of 2, 3, or 4 will be addressed through the response to determination portion of the CDS GSST ([http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/cds/supervision/gsst\\_109.ppt](http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/cds/supervision/gsst_109.ppt)). This will involve self assessment, internal monitoring, and increasing levels of interaction between the site and the CDS State IEU (<http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/spp/index.html>).

**OSEP status table, April 2009:** *OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, to report on the correction of the previously identified noncompliance regarding provision of services to preschool children with disabilities identified in CDS sites on which the State followed up in its September 2007 letters. The State reported that, of 14 total findings of noncompliance identified prior to September 2007, none were corrected within one year, one was subsequently verified as corrected, and 13 remained open. The State reported that the 13 CDS sites with uncorrected findings of noncompliance will be reviewed as part of their second year of monitoring during the FY 08 year*

and will be issued letters of findings reflecting whether or not they have corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2007.

OSEP further required the State to report on the correction of the previously identified noncompliance regarding the provision of services to preschool children identified in the monitoring reports MDOE issued to CDS sites on July 9, 2007, November 15, 2007 and December 7, 2007. The State reported that 14 of 21 findings of noncompliance with Part B identified in the July 9, 2007 monitoring report were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported that the seven remaining areas of noncompliance would be reviewed in the FFY 2008 year as part of the second year of monitoring. The State did not report on the correction of noncompliance identified in the monitoring reports MDOE issued to CDS sites on November 15, 2007 and December 7, 2007.

### **FFY 2007 Monitoring Part B 619**

In April of 2007, State IEU hired a new monitoring and technical assistance consultant to design and implement an on-site monitoring process for CDS. The CDS Consultant for monitoring worked with the Part B 5-20 Program Review team to establish a seamless consistent monitoring process that mirrored the 5-20 process. This process was outlined in the FFY2006 APR. From May 2007 until June of 2008, all sixteen of the regional CDS sites received an on-site monitoring visit which resulted in a formal Letter of Findings. All sixteen sites were required to submit a corrective action plan for Part B in a timely manner to the State IEU for correction of non-compliance to be achieved within one year from the letter of findings. The letters of findings are public and can be found on the Maine Department of Education website at <http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/cds/monitoring/index.html>

### **OSEP's June 6, 2008 response table required MDOE to report on:**

- **The correction of any findings identified in FFY 2006 and corrected in FFY 2007:**
  - **The CDS State IEU did not issue any findings of noncompliance during FFY 2006. However, in accordance with OSEP's February 19, 2008 verification letter Maine removed any specific percentage threshold for identification and correction of Part C and Part B noncompliance in CDS sites and informed all CDS sites in the State of the revocation of its threshold and that information was accepted by OSEP. In addition The CDS State IEU has reviewed its improvement activities for this indicator and revised them, when appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide correction data for findings made in FFY 2007.**
  - **OSEP reviewed documentation received from Maine on April 3, 2008 and concluded that Maine had provided the required assurance. All Letters of Findings and areas of non-compliance that were written before the notification and request for removal of the percentage thresholds were amended and Amended letters were sent to the sites. All Letters of Findings for the sites after**

the February 19, 2008 letter from OSEP reflected the removal of the threshold and measurement of non-compliance to 100% compliance.

- The correction of the previously identified noncompliance that it followed up on in its September 2007 letters; and
  - Correction on those findings is reported in the following table.

Correction of Non-Compliance Identified Prior to September 2007				
MDOE grouped individual instances of noncompliance by legal requirement and CDS site to make findings related to this indicator. To verify correction, subsequent data will be reviewed. In addition, MDOE required follow-up on each individual instance of noncompliance to ensure that services, when not provided timely, were in fact provided.				
Total Findings of Non-Compliance	Findings verified as Corrected within One Year	Findings Subsequently Verified as Corrected	Total Findings Corrected as of Submission	Findings of Non-Compliance Remaining
14		1		13

As requested, Maine was to respond and report on the findings of September of 2007 letters and demonstrate that it had brought closure to the site visits that were conducted by a previous employee in 2005. Fourteen sites were found to have outstanding issues at that time. Of those, one has since completed its required corrective action; however, completion did not occur within the required one year from identification. Verification of findings and requests for submission of corrective action plans from each site were sent to the sites in the spring of 2005. Follow up activities by the sites with assistance from the monitoring consultant from July 2005 to the monitoring consultant’s departure in October 2006 were limited in scope and compliance with federal requirements. The only indicators measured for compliance within the 2005 Letters of Findings were Indicators C7 and B11. It was brought to the attention of the State CDS Director in August of 2007 at the OSEP conference in Baltimore, Maryland that the corrective action plans that had not been closed by the previous monitoring consultant, needed immediate attention and closure. Fourteen of the sixteen sites required follow up. The new monitoring consultant issued letters to the 14 sites requiring a response to their progress towards the 2005 Corrective Action Plans. Responses to the letters were received by January 2008 to the State CDS IEU. The monitoring consultant issued letters in April 2008 to all 14 sites indicating the sites performance in correcting the areas of non-compliance found in 2005. The following is a sample of the body of the letter that was sent to Site 16:

----- begin letter -----

Thank you for responding to the request sent to you on September 28, 2007 attempting to bring closure to the [ Site 16] Child Development Service’s corrective action plan of 2005 and the requests made by Aymie Walshe in a June 2005 letter.

The Corrective Action Plan submitted was based upon compliance in meeting 100% compliance in two areas:

1. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within the Part C’s 45 day timeline.
2. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days.

In a review of your response the documentation provided, data from the state CDS database and the data from your on-site monitoring of 10% of your files, you have not met the requirements set forth in the corrective action plan of 2005. Below is the data used to determine this finding of non-compliance.

	June 2005 Avg # IEPs out of compliance	June 2006 Avg # IEPs out of compliance	June 2007 Avg # IEPs out of compliance	Site Profile for APR 2006- 2007 Avg % Incompliance	November 2007 Avg # IEPs out of compliance	On-Site Monitoring Findings 07-08 Rate of Compliance	Determination Level
Part B 3-5	23	2	2	99.6%	0*	38%	2
Part C B-2	62	24	33	88%	28	0%	3

Determination levels: 1 - Meets Requirements 2 - Needs Assistance 3 – Needs Intervention 4 – Needs Substantial Intervention

\* - data found to be incorrect based on data entry at the site level being done incorrectly

Indicated in the letter sent to you by Aymie Walshe in June of 2005, there was to be an on-site monitoring visit to your site during the summer of 2005. According to all available records, this visit did not occur. Therefore, compliance was not monitored and no corrective action plans were required for the 2006 year.

[Site 16] was recently monitored during October of 2007 and a letter of findings was sent on November 5, 2007 with need for corrective action in several areas. Non-Compliance was found in both Part B and Part C’s timelines for determining eligibility. You submitted a Corrective Action Plan on January 25, 2008 including goals to reach 100% compliance in meeting the required timelines. Compliance with the Corrective Action Plan will be evaluated in December of 2008.

At this time the site 16 has been determined as a level 3 or Needs Intervention for C timelines and a level 2 for Part B timelines based upon the CDS Site Profile for APR submission 2006-2007. The State CDS office has contracted with a consultant to provide on-site training and guidance in developing and complying with your corrective action plan. Training has been provided on the new required special education forms and the required timelines to determine eligibility. The CDS State Director, the [Site 16] Board of Directors and yourself have been working together to improve the site’s overall performance. Further intervention and assistance will be determined based upon periodic review of the state database of compliance with the timelines or upon request by the [Site 16] board of directors.

If compliance cannot be reached by December of 2008, sanctions may be brought against the [Site 16] in accordance with the Maine State Special Education Regulations.

*I look forward to working with you to bring this matter into compliance and meet the needs of the children and families in [Site 16's] county.*

*Sincerely,*

*Erica Thompson  
Distinguished Educator  
Child Development Services  
Monitoring and Technical Assistance*

**--- end letter ---**

Of the sites that were sent a letter based upon findings in 2005, one site, Site 15, has since completed its required corrective action. The finding in 2005 was not monitored for correction in FFY2006. The site was found to be in compliance in FFY2007. The remaining 13 sites remain out of compliance and have corrective action plans in place and technical assistance has been provided. Correction of non-compliance will be monitored in FFY2008 and reported in the FFY2008 APR.

- The correction of noncompliance identified in the monitoring reports The CDS State IEU issued to CDS sites on July 9, 2007, November 15, 2007 and December 7, 2007.

Narrative Report on correction of Non-Compliance identified in the monitoring reports of CDS Sites:

July 9, 2007 Letter of Findings – from here on referred to as Site 10

November 5, 2007 Letter of Findings – From here on referred to as Site 2

November 15, 2007 Letter of Findings - from here on referred to as Site 4

December 7, 2007 Letter of Findings – from here on referred to as Site 16

March 4, 2008 Letter of Findings – from here on referred to as Site 13

March 7, 2008 Letter of Findings – from here on referred to as Site 11

Sites 10, 2 and 4 were visited for a second on-site monitoring visit in April of 2008 to monitor progress in meeting compliance with their corrective action plan.

- Site 10 had 21 findings of non-compliance for Part B 619 in their letter of findings of July 9, 2007. Upon the second visit they were found to have corrected 14 areas of non-compliance in less than one year. They had 7 remaining areas of non-compliance that would be reviewed in the FFY2008 year as part of their second year of monitoring.
- Site 2 had 9 findings of non-compliance for Part B in their letter of findings of November 5, 2007. Upon the second visit they were found to have

corrected 6 areas of non-compliance in less than one year. They had 3 remaining areas of non-compliance that would be reviewed in the FFY2008 year as part of their second year of monitoring.

- **Site 4** had 12 findings of non-compliance for Part B in their letter of findings of November 17, 2007. Upon the second visit they were found to have corrected 9 areas of non-compliance in less than one year. They had 3 remaining areas of non-compliance that would be reviewed in the FFY2008 year as part of their second year of monitoring.

Follow up letters were sent to Sites 2, 4 and 10 informing the Site of their progress in correcting the areas of non-compliance in the original letters of findings.

In September of 2008, Sites 16 and 13 were visited for a second on-site monitoring visit to monitor progress in meeting compliance with their corrective action plan.

- **Site 16** had 18 findings of non-compliance for Part B in their letter of findings of December 4, 2007. Upon the second visit they were found to have corrected 15 areas of non-compliance in less than one year. They had 3 remaining areas of non-compliance that would be reviewed in the FFY 08 year as part of their second year of monitoring. Site 16 Second year of Monitoring visit is scheduled for February of 2009 to monitor progress in correcting non-compliance within one year of the original letter of findings. The visit was originally scheduled for December and January, but due to inclement weather had to be rescheduled.
- **Site 13** had 20 findings of non-compliance for Part B in their letter of findings of March 4, 2008. Upon the second visit they were found to have corrected 5 areas of non-compliance in less than one year. They had 14 remaining areas of non-compliance that would be reviewed in the FFY 08 year as part of their second year of monitoring.

Follow up letters were sent to Sites 2, 4 and 10 informing them of their progress in correcting the areas of non-compliance in the original letters of findings. These letters can be found on the Maine Department of Education website

<http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/cds/monitoring/index.html>

The data collected during these visits will be reflected in the FFY 08 APR. These sites along with the remaining 13 sites are scheduled to receive their second year of monitoring Visit to ensure correction of non-compliance within one year from the findings.

On November 24, 2008 a second on-site monitoring visit was conducted at site 11. Site 11 had previous findings of non-compliance in two MUSER compliance areas for Part B. The visit focused on the two areas of non-compliance with two Part B MUSER regulation requirements. It was determined the site had met compliance for the two outstanding Part B areas of non-compliance. A letter outlining the site's compliance with correcting the areas of non-compliance and continued compliance with Part B will be made public and sent to the site's Board of Directors in February 2009. The data collected during this visit will be reflected in the FFY2008 APR.

- **The correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 The CDS State IEU monitoring reports is reported on in the following table. Correction data for these findings will be reported, as required, as actual target data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010. The one year timeline for all of these findings has not yet expired.**

<b>Correction of Non-Compliance for Other Areas of Non-Compliance Part B 619: Compliance with Maine Unified Special Education Regulations (MUSER)</b>					
<b>The CDS State IEU grouped individual instances of noncompliance by legal requirement and CDS site to make findings related to this indicator. To verify correction, subsequent data will be reviewed. In addition, The CDS State IEU required follow-up on each individual instance of noncompliance to ensure that services, when not provided timely, were in fact provided.</b>					
<b>Year of Findings</b>	<b>Total Findings of Non-Compliance</b>	<b>Findings verified as Corrected within One Year</b>	<b>Findings Subsequently Verified as Corrected</b>	<b>Total Findings Corrected as of Submission</b>	<b>Findings of Non-Compliance Remaining</b>
<b>FFY 2007</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>FFY 2006</b>	<b>There were no findings of non-compliance issued for indicator C1 during the FFY 06 and FFY 05 years</b>				
<b>FFY 2005</b>					

**On February 19, 2008 Maine’s verification letter required the State to provide, within 60 days from the date of that letter, a written assurance that it had removed any specific percentage threshold for identification and correction of Part C and Part B 619 noncompliance in CDS sites and the state of the revocation of its threshold. OSEP reviewed documentation received from Maine on April 3, 2008 and concluded that Maine had provided the required assurance. All Letters of Findings and areas of non-compliance that were written before the notification and request for removal of the percentage thresholds were amended and amended letters were sent to the sites. All Letters of Findings for the sites after the February 19, 2008 letter from OSEP reflected the removal of the threshold and measurement of non-compliance to 100% compliance.**

**Since July of 2008 and the date of the FFY 07 submission, Sites 2, 4 and 10 have received their Second Year of Monitoring Visit to ensure correction of non-compliance within one year from the findings and to review progress in correcting the areas of Non-compliance found in 2005. Letters of the findings of the second year of monitoring will be issued in February of 2009 and reported in the FFY 08 APR and will reflect compliance with findings of non-compliance from FFY 2005 and FFY 2007. One of the three sites, Site 4, was one of the sites that was not issued a letter of findings in 2005. Based on On-site Monitoring Site 4 remains in compliance for**

Indicator C7 as well as B11. Sites 2 and 10's compliance rates are pending and will be reported in a Letter of Findings in February 2009.

As the result of a complaint investigation (08.083 ) relating to individual issues as well as systemic issues, the Department and the State CDS IEU became significantly involved in Site 10 in the spring of 2008.. The state director removed the site director in May 2008 and transferred co-leadership to the directors from Sites 5 and 11. The three sites were then geographically and demographically studied and merged into two sites which are currently overseen by the two directors. They initiated a practice of attending IEP team meetings to model best practices. During the summer of 2008, an independent team of 6 experienced special education administrators reviewed all 180 Part B 619 files at Site 10. While reviewing, they mentored the Site 10 Part B case managers regarding the intent of, and compliance with, Part B. The mentoring process involved training to assure provision of due process, knowledge regarding best practices in file management, meeting facilitation, paperwork completion, service provision, and improved communication skills with parents, providers and stakeholder. The State IEU also contracted with 2 of the certified special education administrators to work with all the staff at the site, both Part B 619 and Part C to continue past the summer to provide additional assistance to the site. These two individuals have modeled best practice for the Part B case managers by physically attending IEP meetings with them and modeling meeting facilitation, parent interaction, best practices, and follow up. Their work will continue throughout this year to address issues deemed appropriate by the state director as we monitor to assure that Part B at the original Site 10 is well supported. The PowerPoint presentations they developed are currently under review at the State IEU level to provide the core prose for web based stand alone training modules which we hope to start posting on the state website later this spring. Additionally, many of the topics that needed clarification at Site 10, the State IEU has addressed at one or more of the Lunch and Learns to provide clarity statewide.

The remaining 13 sites will be reviewed as part of their second year of monitoring during the FFY 08 year and will be issued letters of findings reflecting whether or not they have corrected the findings of non-compliance found in FFY 2005 and FFY 2007. All 16 sites will transition into the General Supervision System outlined above on July 1, 2009. Letters of Findings will be sent based upon the public profiles and determinations of January 2009 as outlined in the Determination Response Table of the General Supervision System. Existing Corrective Action Plans from FFY 08 on-site monitoring will remain in place and will need to be monitored for compliance within one year of the letter of findings. New findings of non-compliance based upon the site profiles may result in additional corrective action.

### Part B School Aged (5 to 20)

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 received letters of finding stating the details of the non-compliance and the requirement to correct the non-compliance discovered as soon as possible, but in no case will it be permitted to exceed 12 months.

FFY 2006 LEA Findings and Correction Timeliness				
LEA	Review month	Letter of findings	Correction closure month	# months to correct non-compliance
1	Jan-07	Mar-07	Oct-07	7
2	Feb-07	Apr-07	Mar-08	11
3	Jan-07	Feb-07	Aug-07	6
4	Apr-07	May-07	Jan-08	8
5	Dec-06	Dec-06	Jun-07	6
6	Apr-07	Apr-07	Nov-07	7
7	May-07	Jun-07	May-08	11
8	Oct-06	Nov-06	Nov-07	12
9	Mar-07	Apr-07	Mar-08	11
10	Sep-06	Nov-06	Jan-08	14
11	Nov-06	Nov-06	Jun-07	7
12	Dec-06	Dec-06	Feb-08	14
13	Mar-07	Apr-07	Jan-08	9
14	Jan-07	Feb-07	Nov-07	9
15	Feb-07	Apr-07	Jun-08	14
16	Mar-07	May-07	May-08	12
17	Feb-07	Apr-07	Jan-08	10
18	May-07			
19	May-07			
20	Jan-07			
21	May-07			
22	Aug-06	Jan-08	Mar-08	2

Non-compliance was corrected in a timely manner in 15 or the 18 cases. Each of the three LEAs with remaining non-compliance beyond twelve months completed their required corrections in 14 months. The non-compliance has been corrected for all findings in FFY 2007. The three non-compliant LEAs had submitted corrective actions and evidence within twelve months, but those corrections were found to be insufficient to correct the non-compliance. Letters of clarification to the LEAs were provided immediately after the review of corrective action response and evidence documentation was received and reviewed. Follow-up actions at the LEAs required

time to resolve the insufficiency, causing the correction of non-compliance to extend beyond 12 months.

OSEP response, June 6, 2008: The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.

The Program Review team reviewed its procedures for monitoring, pupil record audit, interview protocol, and data collection. Modifications to the record audit and data collection procedures have resulted in simplified reporting and verification of compliance to specific indicator requirements of the State Performance Plan. Data collected during audits are easily transferred to letters of finding to facilitate consistent interactions with the LEAs to obtain appropriate and timely corrections.

OSEP response, June 6, 2008: In the FFY 2007 APR, in responding to Indicators 11 and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.

The non-compliance discovered in indicators 11 and 13 were discussed in detail in the narrative of those indicator reports.

**OSEP status table, April 2009:** Finally, OSEP required the State to report on the correction of the remaining four findings of noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005. OSEP could not determine from the State’s narrative whether or not these four remaining findings from FFY 2005 had been corrected.

The four findings of non-compliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005 have been corrected. Each of the four LEAs with outstanding non-compliance were required to implement specific changes to their policies, procedures and practices to correct non-compliance identified and to ensure future incidences would not occur. The depth and complexity of the required corrections varied, but each LEA received a close-out letter confirming acceptance of their corrective actions and approval of their supporting documentation of the corrective actions.

LEA	Date of Letter of Finding	Date of Close-out Letter
1	March 6, 2006	May 18, 2007
2	November 29, 2005	February 3, 2006
3	February 7, 2006	June 22, 2007
4	April 27, 2006	January 16, 2008

PART B INDICATOR 15 WORKSHEET (next three pages)

PART B INDICATOR 15 WORKSHEET (next three pages)

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance 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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0		
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.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0		
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments. 7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0		
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0		
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 Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0		
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0		

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 -educational placements.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0		
6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	3	3	3
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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0		
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0		
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0		
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0		
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	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	7	7	7

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
conducted, within that timeframe.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	<i>0</i>		
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 Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	<i>0</i>		
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	<i>0</i>		
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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	<i>18</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>15</i>
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	<i>0</i>		
Other areas of noncompliance:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	<i>0</i>		
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	<i>12</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>12</i>
<b>Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b</b>			<i>40</i>	<i>37</i>
<b>Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.</b>			<b>(b) / (a) X 100 =</b>	<i>92.5</i>

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007:**

No revisions.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007

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:**

Using Table 7 data: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

$$= [ ( 4 + 9 ) / 13 ] * 100 = 100\%$$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	<i>Actual Target Data for 2007</i>
<b>2007</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007:**

This measure met the target. 100 percent 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. The Due Process Office and the stakeholder group review cases monthly for closure timelines and consideration of support requirements. Cases extended due to exceptional circumstances met the guidelines provided by the Due Process Office for consideration of requests for extension.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007:**

No revisions.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007

### 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:**

Using Table 7 data: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

$$= [ ( 0 + 7 ) / 7 ] * 100 = 100\%$$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	<i>Actual Target Data for 2007</i>
<b>2007</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007:**

This measure met the target. 100 percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. The Due Process Office and the stakeholder group review case status and progress monthly to ensure timeline compliance.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007:**

No revisions.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007

### 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:**

Using Table 7 data: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

$$= ( 3 / 5 ) * 100 = 60\%$$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Actual Target Data for 2007
2007	35%	60%

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007:**

This measure exceeded the target. The Due Process Office produced “Resolution Sessions, A Guide for Parents and Educators” to help parents and educators better understand the resolution session as one of the ways to resolve special education disputes. The handbook will be provided to individuals requesting a due process hearing.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007:**

No revisions.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007

### 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:**

Using Table 7 data: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

$$= [ ( 7 + 28 ) / 42 ] * 100 = 83%$$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Actual Target Data for 2007
2007	78%	83%

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007:**

This measure exceeded the target. In hopes that the individual will choose to participate in mediation, 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, Due Process Office staff follow up with the initiating party to discuss the benefits of mediation. Information is provided on the difference between mediation and an IEP meeting, the expertise, knowledge and objectivity of the mediators on the DPO roster and the wide scope of issues that can be mediated, and the constructive/positive effect participation in mediation can have on the communication between the parties.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007:**

No revisions.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007

### 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 (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	<i>Actual Target Data for 2007</i>
2007	100%	<b>82.6%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007:**

Valid and accurate 618 data were submitted on time and responses to data questions were provided where required. FFY 2006 APR was submitted on time with accurate data for all indicators except B-10; analysis of data for B-10 was revised this year to include missing subgroup information.

**OSEP status table, April 2009: OSEP’s calculation of the data for this indicator is 82.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 of 92.7%.**

**Maine accepts OSEP’s recalculated data. Modifications of Actual Target Data for 2007 above and table data below have been made accordingly.**

## Part B Indicator 20 Data Rubric

Part B Indicator 20 - SPP/APR Data			
APR Indicator	Valid and reliable	Correct calculation	Total
1	1		1
2	1		1
3A	1	1	2
3B	1	1	2
3C	1	1	2
4A	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8	1	1	2
9	1	1	2
10	1	1	2
11	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	1	1	2
14	1	1	2
15	1	1	2
16	1	1	2
17	1	1	2
18	1	1	2
19	1	1	2
		<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>APR Score Calculation</b>	<b>Timely Submission Points</b> (5 pts for submission of APR/SPP by February 2, 2009)		5
	<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>43</b>

Part B Indicator 20 - 618 Data					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Date Note Requests	Total
Table 1 – Child Count Due Date: 2/1/08	1	0	0	1	2
Table 2 – Personnel Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 3 – Ed. Environments Due Date: 2/1/08	1	0	0	1	2
Table 4 – Exiting Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	0	N/A	2
Table 5 – Discipline Due Date: 11/1/08	1	0	0	N/A	1
Table 6 – State Assessment Due Date: 2/1/09	0	1	1	N/A	2
Table 7 – Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	1	N/A	3
				<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Weighted Total</b> (subtotal X 1.87; round ≤.49 down and ≥ .50 up to whole number)				<b>28</b>	
<b>Indicator #20 Calculation</b>					
			A. APR Total	43	43
			B. 618 Total	28	43
			C. Grand Total	71	86
Percent of timely and accurate data = (C divided by 86 times 100)	(C) / (86) X 100 =	82.6			

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007:**

No revisions.

*Appendix*

**Table 7** - REPORT OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION UNDER PART B, OF THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT 2007-08 (Converted to MS Word format)

**Table 6** - REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT (Converted to MS Word format)

**Table 5** - REPORT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL (Converted to MS Word format)

SECTION A: Written, Signed Complaints	
(1) Written, signed complaints total	35
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	13
(a) Reports with findings	9
(b) Reports within timeline	4
(c) Reports within extended timeline	9
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	22
(1.3) Complaints pending	0
(a) Complaints pending a due process hearing	0

SECTION B: Mediation Requests	
(2) Mediation requests total	92
(2.1) Mediations <b>held</b>	42
(a) Mediations <b>held</b> related to due process <b>complaints</b>	11
(i) Mediation agreements	7
(b) Mediations <b>held</b> not related to due process <b>complaints</b>	31
(i) Mediation agreements	28
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	50

SECTION C: Due Process Complaints	
(3) <b>Due process complaints</b> total	35
(3.1) Resolution <b>meetings</b>	5
(a) <b>Written</b> settlement agreements	3
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	7
(a) Decisions within timeline ( <b>include expedited</b> )	0
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	7
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	28

SECTION D: Expedited <b>Due Process Complaints</b> (Related to Disciplinary Decision)	
(4) Expedited <b>due process complaints</b> total	4
(4.1) Resolution <b>meetings</b>	0
(a) <b>Written</b> settlement agreements	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated)	0
(a) Change of placement ordered	0

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE ASSESSMENTS

**DATE:** January 30, 2009 **STATUS:** ORIGINAL SUBMISSION

**Data are due February 1, 2009.**

**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 - AS07MD.XLS)
- 6 Each cell in the attached spreadsheet contains a -9" value by default. If you do not enter a count in each cell it will be determined that the State did not collect the requested data element. In such cases, the State must provide an explanation in the comments section for the missing data. Note that if the submission is missing a required data element, it will not be entered into DANS and the State will be required to resubmit.
- 7 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.**
- 8 Print the entire workbook by selecting, FILE, PRINT and then select ENTIRE

**William Knudsen, Acting Director**

Office of Special Education  
Part B Data Reports  
Program Support Services Group  
Mail Stop 2600  
550 12th Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20202  
Attn: Cheryl Broady

1 If you received your file by e-mail, please return electronic copies of completed DTS forms

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

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

Version Date: 12/1/2008

2007-2008

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION A. ENROLLMENT DATA FOR THE MATH ASSESSMENT1

DATE OF ENROLLMENT COUNT: 4/1/2008

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH IEPs (1)	ALL STUDENTS (2)
3	2350	13803
4	2513	14206
5	2539	14240
6	2501	14365
7	2540	14818
8	2495	15274
HIGH SCHOOL (SPECIFY GRADE:) 11	2200	15604

<sup>1</sup> At a date as close as possible to the testing date.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION  
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION  
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

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

2007-2008

PAGE 2 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

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 ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS	
	TOTAL (3)	SUBSET (OF 3) WHO TOOK THE ASSESSMENT WITH ACCOMODATIONS (3A)
3	2208	1729
4	2372	1998
5	2390	1986
6	2283	1910
7	2321	1900
8	2265	1844
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	1898	1110

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 ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4A)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON MODIFIED ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4B)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON ALTERNATE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4C)
3	121	121	0	0
4	126	126	0	0
5	136	136	0	0
6	196	196	0	0
7	176	176	0	0
8	176	176	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	209	209	0	0

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: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: ME -MAINE

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

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS COUNTED AS NONPARTICIPANTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH NCLB				
	STUDENTS WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID <sup>1</sup> (5)	STUDENTS WHO TOOK AN OUT OF LEVEL TEST (6)	STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE ANY ASSESSMENT		
			PARENTAL EXEMPTION (7)	ABSENT (8)	EXEMPT FOR OTHER REASONS <sup>2</sup> (9)
3	0	0	0	21	0
4	0	0	0	15	0
5	0	0	0	13	0
6	0	0	0	22	0
7	0	0	0	43	0
8	0	0	0	54	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	0	0	0	93	0

<sup>1</sup>Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problem in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of 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 without these changes.

<sup>2</sup>In a separate listing, report the number of students who did not take an assessment for other reasons by grade and specific reason.

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

STATE: ME -MAINE

2007-2008

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT

REGULAR ASSESSMENT BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10A)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Does Not Meet	Partially Meets	Meets	Exceeds						
		Achievement Level									
3	MEA	471	815	782	140	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	2208
4	MEA	721	845	745	61	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	2372
5	MEA	842	805	689	54	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	2390
6	MEA	1123	714	400	46	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	2283
7	MEA	1278	610	376	57	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	2321
8	MEA	1413	501	324	27	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	2265
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	SAT	1336	412	148	2	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	1898

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: Meets

<sup>1</sup>The total number of students reported by achievement in 10A is to equal the number reported in column 3.

2007-2008

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

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10B)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	attempting	emerging	meeting	exceeding						10B ROW TOTAL <sub>1</sub>
		Achievement Level									
3	PAAP	12	12	57	40	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	121
4	PAAP	8	18	63	37	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	126
5	PAAP	15	21	59	41	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	136
6	PAAP	22	43	67	64	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	196
7	PAAP	15	56	55	50	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	176
8	PAAP	16	55	52	53	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	176
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	PAAP	15	73	57	64	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	209

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

STATE: ME - MAINE

2007-2008

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

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON MODIFIED ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10C)												
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Achievement Level	10C ROW TOTAL <sup>1</sup>	Number of students included Within the NCLB 2% Cap <sup>2,3</sup>								
3		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
4		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
5		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
6		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
7		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
8		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
HIGH SCHOOL : 11		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:

<sup>1</sup> The total number of students reported by achievement level in 10C is to equal the number reported in column 4B.

<sup>2</sup> Include all students whose assessment counted as proficient because they fell within the NCLB 2% cap.

<sup>3</sup> Use 2% adjusted cap, in accordance with NCLB provisions, if applicable. See page 8 of attached instructions.

STATE: ME - MAINE

2007-2008

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

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON ALTERNATE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10D)												
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Achievement Level	10D ROW TOTAL <sup>2</sup>	Number of Students Included Within the NCLB 1% Cap <sup>1</sup>								
3		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
4		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
5		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
6		9-9	9-9	9-9	9-9	9-9	9-9	9-9	9-9	9-9	9-9	9-9
7		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
8		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
HIGH SCHOOL : 11		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:

<sup>1</sup> Include all students whose assessment counted as proficient because they fell within NCLB 1% cap.

<sup>2</sup> The total number of students reported by achievement level in 10D is to equal the number reported in column 4C

2007-2008

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

GRADE LEVEL	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10A (FROM PAGE 5) <sup>1</sup>	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10B (FROM PAGE 6) <sup>1</sup>	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10C (FROM PAGE 7) <sup>1</sup>	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10D (FROM PAGE 8) <sup>1</sup>	NO VALID SCORE <sup>1,2</sup> (11)	TOTAL <sup>1,3</sup> (12)
3	2208	121	-9	-9	21	2350
44	2372	126	-9	-9	15	2513
5	2390	136	-9	-9	13	2539
6	2283	196	-9	-9	22	2501
7	2321	176	-9	-9	43	2540
8	2265	176	-9	-9	54	2495
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	1898	209	-9	-9	93	2200

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>2</sup> Column 11 is calculated by summing the numbers reported in column 5 plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8 plus column 9. <sup>3</sup> Column 12 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 12 should always equal the sum of the number of students reported in column 3 plus column 4 plus column 5 plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8 plus column 9.

2007-2008

STATE: ME -MAINE

SECTION D. ENROLLMENT DATA FOR THE READING ASSESSMENT1

DATE OF ENROLLMENT COUNT: 4/1/2008

GRADE LEVEL		STUDENTS WITH IEPs (1)	ALL STUDENTS (2)
3		2351	13803
4		2515	14206
5		2541	14240
6		2501	14365
7		2540	14818
8		2495	15274
HIGH SCHOOL (SPECIFY GRADE:)	11	2200	15604

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

2007-2008

ME -MAINE

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS		
	TOTAL (3)	SUBSET (OF 3) WHO TOOK THE ASSESSMENT WITH ACCOMODATIONS (3A)	LEP STUDENTS IN US < 12 MONTHS WHOSE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY (ELP) TEST REPLACED REGULAR READING ASSESSMENT (3B)
3	2210	1735	0
4	2378	2013	0
5	2392	1996	0
6	2282	1909	0
7	2330	1912	0
8	2269	1832	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	1825	1108	0

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 ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4A)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON MODIFIED ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4B)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON ALTERNATE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4C)
3	123	123	00	00
4	126	126	0	0
5	136	136	0	0
6	197	197	0	0
7	178	178	0	0
8	177	177	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	209	209	0	0

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

FORM EXPIRES:  
 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: ME -MAINE

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

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS COUNTED AS NONPARTICIPANTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH NCLB				
	STUDENTS WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID <sup>1</sup> (5)	STUDENTS WHO TOOK AN OUT OF LEVEL AN OUT OF LEVEL TEST (6)	STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE ANY ASSESSMENT		
			PARENTAL EXEMPTION (7)	ABSENT (8)	DID NOT TAKE FOR DID NOT TAKE FOR OTHER REASONS <sup>2</sup> (9)
3	0	0	0	18	0
4	0	0	0	11	0
5	0	0	0	13	0
6	0	0	0	22	0
7	0	0	0	32	0
8	0	0	0	49	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	0	0	0	166	0

<sup>1</sup> Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problem in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of assessment, students do not fill 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 the

<sup>2</sup> In a separate listing, report the number of students who did not take an assessment for other reasons by grade and specific reason.

2007-2008

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT

REGULAR ASSESSMENT BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10A)									
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Does Not Meet	Partially Meets	Meets	Exceeds				10A ROW TOTAL <sup>1</sup>
		Achievement Level							
3	MEA	443	1062	697	8	-9	-9	-9	2210
4	MEA	611	1056	701	10	-9	-9	-9	2378
5	MEA	735	1016	632	9	-9	-9	-9	2392
6	MEA	614	956	670	42	-9	-9	-9	2282
7	MEA	753	829	708	40	-9	-9	-9	2330
8	MEA	951	718	543	57	-9	-9	-9	2269
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	SAT	1196	435	171	23	-9	-9	-9	1825

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:

<sup>1</sup>The total number of students reported by achievement in 10A is to equal the number reported in column 3.

2007-2008

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

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10B)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	attempting	emerging	meeting	exceeding						10B ROW TOTAL <sup>1</sup>
		Achievement Level									
3	PAAP	12	30	45	36	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	123
4	PAAP	10	39	40	37	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	126
5	PAAP	14	40	41	41	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	136
6	PAAP	19	54	89	35	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	197
7	PAAP	19	45	91	23	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	178
8	PAAP	15	58	77	27	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	177
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	PAAP	22	51	120	16	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	209

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:

<sup>1</sup> The total number of students reported by achievement level in 10B is equal the number reported in column 4A.

2007-2008

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

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON <b>MODIFIED</b> ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10C)												
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Achievement Level	10C ROW TOTAL <sup>1</sup>	Number of students included Within the NCLB 2% Cap <sup>2,3</sup>								
3		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
4		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
5		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
6		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
7		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
8		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
HIGH SCHOOL : 11		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:

<sup>1</sup> The total number of students reported by achievement level in 10C is to equal the number reported in column 4B.

<sup>2</sup> Include all students whose assessment counted as proficient because they fell within the NCLB 2% cap.

<sup>3</sup> Use 2% adjusted cap, in accordance with NCLB provisions, if applicable. See page 8 of attached instructions.

STATE: ME - MAINE

2007-2008

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

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON ALTERNATE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10D)												
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Achievement Level	10D ROW TOTAL <sup>2</sup>	Number of Students Included Within the NCLB 1% Cap <sup>1</sup>								
3		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
4		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
5		-99	-99	-99	-99	-99	-99	-99	-99	-99	-99	-99
6		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
7		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
8		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
HIGH SCHOOL : 11		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:

<sup>1</sup> Include all students whose assessment counted as proficient because they fell within NCLB 1% cap.

<sup>2</sup> The total number of students reported by achievement level in 10D is to equal the number reported in column 4C

STATE: ME - MAINE

2007-2008

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

GRADE LEVEL	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10A (FROM PAGE 14) <sup>1</sup>	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10B (FROM PAGE 15) <sup>1</sup>	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10C (FROM PAGE 16) <sup>1</sup>	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10D (FROM PAGE 17) <sup>1</sup>	NO VALID SCORE <sup>1,2</sup> (11)	TOTAL <sup>1,3</sup> (12)
3	2210	123	-9	-9	18	2351
4	2378	126	-9	-9	11	2515
5	2392	136	-9	-9	13	2541
6	2282	197	-9	-9	22	2501
7	2330	178	-9	-9	32	2540
8	2269	177	-9	-9	49	2495
HIGH SCHOOL : 11	1825	209	-9	-9	166	2200

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>2</sup> Column 11 is calculated by summing the numbers reported in column 5 plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8 plus column 9. <sup>3</sup> Column 12 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 12 should always equal the sum of the number of students reported in column 3 plus column 4 plus column 5 plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8 plus column 9.







**Date:** November 1, 2008 **Status:** ORIGINAL SUBMISSION

**Part B, discipline data are due November 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 - DISP07MD.XLS)
- 6 Each cell in the attached spreadsheet contains a "-9" value by default. If you do not enter a count in each cell it will be determined that the State did not collect the requested data element. In such cases, the State must provide an explanation in the comments section for the missing data. Note that if the submission is missing a required data element, it will not be entered into DANS and the State will be required to resubmit.
- 7 RED cells indicate computational errors or an error in reporting race/ethnicity. Sum totals for race/ethnicity must be equal to reported totals. **Please make sure there are NO RED CELLS before saving and submitting data.**
- 8 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:

**William Knudsen, Acting Director**

Office of Special Education

Part B Data Reports

Program Support Services Group

Mail Stop 2600

550 12th Street, S.W.

Washington, D.C. 20202

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

IDEADData\_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.

Version Date: 9/12/2008

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION A. DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL TYPE BY DISABILITY

Children with Disabilities Ages 3-21	1. Unilateral Removals to an Interim Alternative Educational Setting by School Personnel				2. Removals to an Interim Alternative Educational Setting Based on a Hearing Officer Determination Regarding Likely Injury
	A. Number of Children	B. Number of Removals for Drugs	C. Number of Removals for Weapons	D. Number of Removals for Serious Bodily Injury	Number of Children
1. Mental Retardation	1	0	1	0	0
2. Hearing Impairments	0	0	0	0	0
3. Speech/Language Impairments	0	0	0	0	0
4. Visual Impairments	0	0	0	0	0
5. Emotional Disturbance	0	0	0	0	1
6. Orthopedic Impairments	0	0	0	0	0
7. Other Health Impairments	3	1	1	1	1
8. Specific Learning Disabilities	0	0	0	0	1
9. Deaf-Blindness	0	0	0	0	0
10. Multiple Disabilities	1	0	1	0	1
11. Autism	0	0	0	0	0
12. Traumatic Brain Injury	0	0	0	0	0
13. Developmental Delay <sup>1</sup>	0	0	0	0	0
14. Total	5	1	3	1	4

<sup>1</sup> States must have defined and established eligibility criteria for developmental delay in order to use this category for reporting.  
COMPUTED TOTALS 5 1 3 1 4

TABLE 5, SECTION A

REPORT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL:

SCHOOL YEAR 2007-2008

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION A. (CONTINUED)

Children with Disabilities Ages 3-21	(PERCENT) <sup>1</sup> by School Personnel 1. Unilateral Removals to an Interim Alternative Educational Setting			
	A. Number of Children (PERCENT)	B. Number of Removals for Drugs (PERCENT)	C. Number of Removals for Weapons (PERCENT)	D. Number of Removals for Serious Bodily Injury (PERCENT)
1. Mental Retardation	20%	0%	33%	0%
2. Hearing Impairments	0%	0%	0%	0%
3. Speech/Language Impairments	0%	0%	0%	0%
4. Visual Impairments <sup>2</sup>	0%	0%	0%	0%
5. Emotional Disturbance	0%	0%	0%	0%
6. Orthopedic Impairments	0%	0%	0%	0%
7. Other Health Impairments	60%	100%	33%	100%
8. Specific Learning Disabilities	0%	0%	0%	0%
9. Deaf-Blindness	0%	0%	0%	0%
10. Multiple Disabilities	20%	0%	33%	0%
11. Autism	0%	0%	0%	0%
12. Traumatic Brain Injury	0%	0%	0%	0%
13. Developmental Delay <sup>2</sup>	0%	0%	0%	0%
14. Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

<sup>1</sup> STATES SHOULD NOT PROVIDE PERCENTAGES IN THIS SECTION, AS THEY WILL BE CALCULATED AFTER THE COUNTS ARE SUBMITTED.

<sup>2</sup> States must have defined and established eligibility criteria for developmental delay in order to use this category for reporting.

TABLE 5, SECTION A

REPORT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL:

SCHOOL YEAR **2007-2008**

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION A. (CONTINUED)

Children with Disabilities Ages 3-21		5. Disciplinary Removals		
Disability	A. Total Disciplinary Removals	B. Number of Children with Disciplinary Removals Totaling 1 Day	C. Number of Children with Disciplinary Removals Totaling 2-10 Days	D. Number of Children with Disciplinary Removals Totaling > 10 Days
1. Mental Retardation	90	9	39	6
2. Hearing Impairments	15	2	9	1
3. Speech/Language Impairments	293	66	112	11
4. Visual Impairments	3	1	2	0
5. Emotional Disturbance	1264	163	403	85
6. Orthopedic Impairments	6	0	0	1
7. Other Health Impairments	1374	190	516	94
8 Specific Learning Disabilities <sup>1</sup> 8. Specific Learning Disabilities	1471	220	605	102
9. Deaf-Blindness	0	0	0	0
10. Multiple Disabilities	500	51	175	29
11. Autism	86	13	39	1
12. Traumatic Brain Injury	8	1	4	1
13. Developmental Delay <sup>1</sup>	5	0	2	1
14. Total	5115	716	1906	332

<sup>1</sup>States must have defined and established eligibility criteria for developmental delay in order to use this category for reporting.

TABLE 5, SECTION A

REPORT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL:

SCHOOL YEAR 2007-2008

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION A. (CONTINUED)

Children with Disabilities Ages 3-21	3. Out-of-School Suspensions or Expulsions		4. In-School Suspensions		3. Out-of-School Suspensions or Expulsions (PERCENT) <sup>1</sup>
	A. Number of Children with Out-of-School Suspension/Expulsions Totaling 10 Days or Less	B. Number of Children with Out-of-School Suspension/Expulsions Totaling > 10 Days	A. Number of Children with In-School Suspensions Totaling 10 Days or Less	B. Number of Children with In-School Suspensions Totaling > 10 Days	B. Number of Children with Out-of-School Suspension/Expulsions Totaling > 10 Days(PERCENT) <sup>1</sup>
1. Mental Retardation	37	5	11	0	2%
2. Hearing Impairments	9	1	2	0	0%
3. Speech/Language Impairments	108	11	70	0	3%
4. Visual Impairments	2	0	1	0	0%
5. Emotional Disturbance	421	85	144	0	27%
6. Orthopedic Impairments	0	1	0	0	0%
7. Other Health Impairments	501	88	205	2	28%
8. Specific Learning Disabilities	590	100	234	2	31%
9. Deaf-Blindness	0	0	0	0	0%
10. Multiple Disabilities	178	26	47	2	8%
11. Autism	44	1	8	0	0%
12. Traumatic Brain Injury	4	1	1	0	0%
13. Developmental Delay <sup>2</sup>	2	1	0	0	0%
14. Total	1896	320	723	6	100%

<sup>1</sup> STATES SHOULD NOT PROVIDE PERCENTAGES IN THIS SECTION, AS THEY WILL BE CALCULATED AFTER THE COUNTS ARE SUBMITTED.

<sup>2</sup> States must have defined and established eligibility criteria for developmental delay in order to use this category for reporting.

TABLE 5, SECTION B PROGRAMS  
 REPORT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL:

SCHOOL YEAR **2007-2008**

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION B. DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL TYPE BY RACE/ETHNICITY

Children with Disabilities Ages 3-21		by School Personnel 1. Unilateral Removals to an Interim Alternative Educational Setting				2. Removals to an Interim Alternative Educational Setting Based on a Hearing Officer Determination Regarding Likely Injury
RACE/ETHNICITY	A. Number of Children	B. Number of Removals for Drugs	C. Number of Removals for Weapons	D. Number of Removals for Serious Bodily Injury	Number of Children	
1. American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	
2. Asian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	
3. Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	
4. Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	
5. White, non-Hispanic	5	1	3	1	4	
6. Total	5	1	3	1	4	

TABLE 5, SECTION B

REPORT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL:

SCHOOL YEAR **2007-2008**

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION B. (CONTINUED)

by School Personnel (PERCENT) <sup>1</sup> 1. Unilateral Removals to an Interim Alternative Educational Setting				
Children with Disabilities Ages 3-21				
Race/Ethnicity	A. Number of Children (PERCENT)	B. Number of Removals for Drugs (PERCENT)	C. Number of Removals for Weapons (PERCENT)	D. Number of Removals for Serious Bodily Injury (PERCENT)
1. American Indian or Alaska Native	0%	0%	0%	0%
2. American Indian or Alaska Native, Other Pacific Islander	0%	0%	0%	0%
3. Black, non-Hispanic	0%	0%	0%	0%
4. Hispanic	0%	0%	0%	0%
5. White, non-Hispanic	100%	100%	100%	100%
6. Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

<sup>1</sup> STATES SHOULD NOT PROVIDE PERCENTAGES IN THIS SECTION, AS THEY WILL BE CALCULATED AFTER THE COUNTS ARE SUBMITTED.

TABLE 5, SECTION B

REPORT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL:

SCHOOL YEAR **2007-2008**

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION B. (CONTINUED)

Children with Disabilities Ages 3-21	3. Out-of-School Suspensions or Expulsions		4. In-School Suspensions		3. Out-of-School Suspensions or Expulsions (PERCENT) <sup>1</sup>
	A. Number of Children with Out-of-School Suspension/Expulsions Totaling 10 Days or Less	B. Number of Children with Out-of-School Suspension/Expulsions Totaling > 10 Days	A. Number of Children with In-School Suspensions Totaling 10 Days or Less	B. Number of Children with In-School Suspensions Totaling > 10 Days	B. Number of Children with Out-of-School Suspension/Expulsions Totaling > 10 Days (PERCENT)
Race/Ethnicity					(PERCENT)
1. American Indian or Alaska Native	21	5	11	1	2%
2. Asian or Other Pacific Islander	12	4	6	0	1%
3. Black, non-Hispanic	57	6	10	0	2%
4. Hispanic	29	10	15	0	3%
5. White, non-Hispanic	1777	295	681	5	92%
6. Total	1896	320	723	6	100%

<sup>1</sup> STATES SHOULD NOT PROVIDE PERCENTAGES IN THIS SECTION, AS THEY WILL BE CALCULATED AFTER THE COUNTS ARE SUBMITTED.

TABLE 5, SECTION B REPORT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES SUBJECT TO  
DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL:  
SCHOOL YEAR **2007-2008**

STATE: ME - MAINE

## SECTION B. (CONTINUED)

Children with Disabilities Ages 3-21		5. Disciplinary Removals		
Race/Ethnicity	A. Total Disciplinary Removals	B. Number of Children with Disciplinary Removals Totaling 1 Day	C. Number of Children with Disciplinary Removals Totaling 2-10 Days	D. Number of Children with Disciplinary Removals Totaling > 10 Days
1. American Indian or Alaska Native	68	5	27	6
2. Asian or Other Pacific Islander	37	6	12	4
3. Black, non-Hispanic	120	14	53	6
4. Hispanic	112	16	28	10
5. White, non-Hispanic	4778	675	1786	306
6. Total	5115	716	1906	332

TABLE 5, SECTION C REPORT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES  
SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL:  
SCHOOL YEAR **2007-2008**

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION C. DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL TYPE BY GENDER

Children with Disabilities Ages 3-21		1. Unilateral Removals to an Interim Alternative Educational Setting by School Personnel			2. Removals to an Interim Alternative Educational Setting Based on a Hearing Officer Determination Regarding Likely Injury
Gender	A. Number of Children	B. Number of Removals for Drugs	C. Number of Removals for Weapons	D. Number of Removals for Serious Bodily Injury	Number of Children
1. Male	4	1	2	1	3
2. Female	1	0	1	0	1
3 Total3. Total	55	11	33	11	44

SECTION C. (CONTINUED)

Children with Disabilities Ages 3-21		by School Personnel (PERCENT) 1. Unilateral Removals to an Interim Alternative Educational Setting			
Gender	A. Number of Children (PERCENT)	B. Number of Removals for Drugs (PERCENT)	C. Number of Removals for Weapons(PERCENT)	D. Number of Removals for Serious Bodily Injury(PERCENT)	
1. Male	80%	100%	67%	100%	
2. Female	20%	0%	33%	0%	
3. Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	

<sup>1</sup>STATES SHOULD NOT PROVIDE PERCENTAGES IN THIS SECTION, AS THEY WILL BE CALCULATED AFTER THE COUNTS ARE SUBMITTED.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND  
 REHABILITATIVE SERVICES  
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION  
 PROGRAMS FORM

Page 10 of 15

OMB NO.: 1820-0621

EXPIRES: 8/31/2009

TABLE 5, SECTION C

REPORT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL:

SCHOOL YEAR **2007-2008**

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION C. (CONTINUED)

Children with Disabilities Ages 3-21	3. Out-of-School Suspensions or Expulsions		4. In-School Suspensions		3. Out-of-School Suspensions or Expulsions (PERCENT) <sup>1</sup>
	A. Number of Children with Out-of-School Suspension/Expulsions Totaling 10 Days or Less	B. Number of Children with Out-of-School Suspension/Expulsions Totaling > 10 Days	A. Number of Children with In-School Suspensions Totaling 10 Days or Less	B. Number of Children with In-School Suspensions Totaling > 10 Days	B. Number of Children with Out-of-School Suspension/Expulsions Totaling > 10 Days (PERCENT)
Gender	Gender	Less	Days	or Less	(PERCENT)
1. Male	1555	273	595	5	85%
2. Female	341	47	128	1	15%
3. Total	1896	320	723	6	100%

<sup>1</sup>STATES SHOULD NOT PROVIDE PERCENTAGES IN THIS SECTION, AS THEY WILL BE CALCULATED AFTER THE COUNTS ARE SUBMITTED.

TABLE 5, SECTION C REPORT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES SUBJECT TO  
 DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL:  
 SCHOOL YEAR **2007-2008**

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION C. (CONTINUED)

Children with Disabilities Ages 3-21	5. Disciplinary Removals			
	A. Total Disciplinary Removals	B. Number of Children with Disciplinary Removals Totaling 1 Day	C. Number of Children with Disciplinary Removals Totaling 2-10 Days	D. Number of Children with Disciplinary Removals Totaling > 10 Days
Gender				
1. Male	4281	579	1573	283
2. Female	834	137	333	49
3. Total	5115	716	1906	332

TABLE 5, SECTION D REPORT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY  
REMOVAL:

SCHOOL YEAR **2007-2008**

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION D. DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL TYPE BY LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY STATUS

Children with Disabilities Ages 3-21	1. Unilateral Removals to an Interim Alternative Educational Setting by School Personnel				2. Removals to an Interim Alternative Educational Setting Based on a Hearing Officer Determination Regarding Likely Injury
	Limited English Proficiency Status	A. Number of Children	B. Number of Removals for Drugs	C. Number of Removals for Weapons	D. Number of Removals for Serious Bodily Injury
1. Yes	0	0	0	0	0
2. No	5	1	3	1	4
3. Total	5	1	3	1	4

SECTION C. (CONTINUED)

Children with Disabilities Ages 3-21	by School Personnel (PERCENT) <sup>1</sup> 1. Unilateral Removals to an Interim Alternative Educational Setting			
	Limited English Proficiency Status	A. Number of Children (PERCENT)	B. Number of Removals for Drugs (PERCENT)	C. Number of Removals for Weapons (PERCENT)
1. Yes	0%	0%	0%	0%
2. No	100%	100%	100%	100%
3. Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

<sup>1</sup> STATES SHOULD NOT PROVIDE PERCENTAGES IN THIS SECTION, AS THEY WILL BE CALCULATED AFTER THE COUNTS ARE SUBMITTED.

TABLE 5, SECTION D

REPORT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL:

SCHOOL YEAR **2007-2008** STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION D. (CONTINUED)

Children with Disabilities Ages 3-21	3. Out-of-School Suspensions or Expulsions		4. In-School Suspensions		3. Out-of-School Suspensions or Expulsions (PERCENT) <sup>1</sup>
	A. Number of Children with Out-of-School Suspension/Expulsions Totaling 10 Days or Less	B. Number of Children with Out-of-School Suspension/Expulsions Totaling > 10 Days	A. Number of Children with In-School Suspensions Totaling 10 Days or Less	B. Number of Children with In-School Suspensions Totaling > 10 Days	B. Number of Children with Out-of-School Suspension/Expulsions Totaling > 10 Days (PERCENT)
Limited English Proficiency Status					(PERCENT)
1. Yes	20	6	9	0	2%
2. No	1876	314	714	6	98%
3. Total	1896	320	723	6	100%

<sup>1</sup> STATES SHOULD NOT PROVIDE PERCENTAGES IN THIS SECTION, AS THEY WILL BE CALCULATED AFTER THE COUNTS ARE SUBMITTED.

TABLE 5, SECTION D

REPORT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL:  
 SCHOOL YEAR **2007-2008**

STATE: ME - MAINE

SECTION D. (CONTINUED)

Children with Disabilities Ages 3-21	5. Disciplinary Removals			
	A. Total Disciplinary Removals	B. Number of Children with Disciplinary Removals Totaling 1 Day	C. Number of Children with Disciplinary Removals Totaling 2-10 Days	D. Number of Children with Disciplinary Removals Totaling > 10 Days
Limited English Proficiency Status				
1. Yes	61	11	18	6
2. No	5054	705	1888	326
3. Total	5115	716	1906	332

TABLE 5, SECTION E REPORT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES SUBJECT TO  
 DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL:

SCHOOL YEAR **2007-2008**

ME - MAINE

SECTION E. CHILDREN SUBJECT TO EXPULSION WITH AND WITHOUT EDUCATIONAL SERVICES BY DISABILITY STATUS

Children with Disabilities Ages 3-21	6. Children Subject to Expulsion			
	A. Received Educational Services During Expulsion	B. Did Not Receive Educational Services During Expulsion	Percent	
1. Children with Disabilities Ages 3-21	- 9	-9	0.00%	0.00%
2. Children without Disabilities, Grades K-12	- 9	-9	0.00%	0.00%

<sup>1</sup> STATES SHOULD NOT PROVIDE PERCENTAGES IN THIS SECTION, AS THEY WILL BE CALCULATED AFTER THE COUNTS ARE SUBMITTED.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND  
REHABILITATIVE SERVICES  
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION  
PROGRAMS

COMMENTS

TABLE 5

REPORT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL:

[Back](#)

SCHOOL YEAR **2007-2008**

COMMENTS

STATE: ME - MAINE

ORIGINAL SUBMISSION  
CURRENT DATE: November 01, 2008  
Version Date: 9/12/2008