



State of Maine

Department of Education

Part C Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006

April 14, 2008

Revisions and clarifications to February 1, 2008 submission

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

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

This Annual Performance Report (APR) is the second report of the progress toward the targets established in the State Performance Plan (SPP) on December 2, 2005. The APR will present the second year of progress toward the Measurable and Rigorous Targets established in the SPP for all indicators. New indicators have seen data collected this year that provide baseline or entry data that is presented in the update to the SPP.

Maine Advisory Council for the Education of Children with Disabilities (MACECD) was the stakeholder organization supporting the development of the SPP indicators and continues to review progress toward the targets. Development of indicator content and revision of indicators has been guided by the stakeholder group throughout the past 13 months. The stakeholder group regularly reviews data developed for each measurement, formulates and pursues hypotheses associated with the data, and builds recommendations for the Maine Department of Education to consider in legislation, rule making, procedures and reporting. The quality of Maine's SPP and its APR have benefited greatly from the advice and guidance of our stakeholder organization.

Monitoring intense efforts in place for monitoring - Since March of 2007, significant efforts have been made to secure staff to develop and implement a new monitoring system to ensure the sites are complying with federal requirements. Since May of 2007, 6 sites have undergone the complete on-site and internal monitoring process and two are at the initial stages of the process. Four of which have received letters of findings and have submitted corrective action plans. The state has implemented a schedule to monitor all sixteen sites by May of 2008 with completed letters of findings by June of 2008. The monitoring system and activities will be clearly articulated in the description of activities in indicator 9.

Maine's Child Development Services is the system at the state level that supports the local work that occurs for children birth through 5 and their families receiving Part C and Part B services. 2006 - 2007 was a year of significant change within this organizational structure. Maine CDS has historically been structured as 16 regional/county level sites with regional governing boards and one central state oversight office. Significant legislation (Chapter 662) was passed in the spring of 2006 to facilitate centralization of policies, human resources and fiscal resources of the organization from the site level to the state level. The 16 sites were retained with an outline of centralization of fiscal, human resources and policies to be achieved within a year at the state level. In July 2006, a new CDS State Director was appointed by the Commissioner of Education. The new state director has been supported in the transition and restructuring by a state level advisory committee with representative membership from each of the site boards.

Chapter 662 also created a subcommittee to study special education for children birth to age 8 in the fall of 2006. This task force concluded its deliberations and a report was submitted to the legislature with their recommendations in February of 2007. Key to the task force report was recommendations to maintain CDS within the Department of Education and to maintain it as a B-5 system. Since submission of the February 2007 APR, the legislature revisited their work for Chapter 662 and extended the timelines for the work in progress through LD 836 which was approved as Chapter 307. Child Development Services has undergone significant structural, fiscal and human resource changes as a result of legislative action in 2006 and 2007. An outline of activities undertaken by CDS in response to Chapter 662 is included in the appendix. The outline will be updated this March for presentation to the education committee this legislative session.

The changes that occurred were far reaching and created uncertainty in the stakeholder community and at the regional sites. In an effort to clarify the status of the system and its impact on Children and Families, Regional Sites and the State IEU, the state office developed a structural analysis of the system for FY06, FY07, and FY08)

This analysis was shared with our B-20 State Advisory Committee (MACECD), The CDS State Level Advisory Committee and it is on our website: [Maine Special Services-MACECD](#)

Much of the work that occurred in FFY2006 was critical to lay a basis for the continuing improvement of our system. The state IEU has initiated partnerships with stakeholders to work on projects. The Center for Community Inclusion is assisting us with the following: revision of our program approval process and review of currently approved programs, data collection to support pilot programs for inclusive options in the LRE, training in the Primary Service Provision Model, and the development of an improved central directory. The Maine Parent Federation has worked closely with us to facilitate training and we have partnered with Maine Roads to Quality to focus on curriculum development for pre-service training for preschool educators.

We continue to work with a vendor for the ongoing construction of our Case E system. The intricate interrelationship of the Case E system with our fiscal centralization allows us to monitor our regional sites for data, fiscal, and compliance areas. This ensures that state level personnel are all aware of the varied components of our system and support each other through cross training. The team building that is occurring results in heightened awareness of our process. This increased awareness and resulting communication with our regional CDS sites is integral to the facilitation of the change process we are involved in.

We recognize that our change process is ongoing. Based on the actions of the Governor in 2007, regionalization and centralization of school units has resulted in the reorganization of 290 school units to approximately 80 regional school units and the number of superintendents from 152 to 80 by June 2009. These efforts will effect change in our service system for children 5-20 and will ultimately affect the correlation of the regional CDS sites with their local regional school units and potentially their provider base. Maine is facing significant challenges socially and economically as the state struggles with decreasing state and federal resources. The decrease in federal dollars in Medicaid is a significant example of this. Our immediate goal is to assess the impact while continuing to move forward in meeting federal compliance.

The APR that follows presents the indicator performance in a consistent design that will enable the reader to follow the discussion and quickly determine specific details of the report. The indicators are presented on the OSEP defined template design for the APR for most indicators. As required for FFY2006, indicator 3 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.

Font and Color Legend	Description	
Black	Required language from the original OSEP template.	Leave as is.
Black (Arial, size 10)	Required language from the original OSEP template, Maine's response narrative.	Language presented is the report of progress, slippage and performance to the requirement of the SPP for the reporting year FFY2006.
Violet (Times New Roman, size 12)	Goal from the SPP	Entered into the template as part of the reporting the FFY2006 Target requirement.
Green(Times New Roman, size 11)	Notes from the APR Response Table the accompanied the June 15, 2007 response letter from OSEP.	Included in the APR submission with an immediately following direct response to the concern or issue presented.
Teal (Arial, bold, size 12/10)	Data for FFY 2006	Entered the data both in raw numbers in formulae in the measurement tables and as percentages in the FFY2006 Actual Target Data tables.
Blue (various)	SPP form	The heading of the SPP template to indicate the different form style for indicator 3

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

Table of Contents

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner..... 6

Indicator 2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children..... 11

Indicator 3: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved: 13

Indicator 4: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:..... 21

Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:..... 24

Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:..... 27

Indicator 7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline. 30

Indicator 8: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:..... 33

Indicator 9: 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. 38

Indicator 10: 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..... 43

Indicator 11: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline. 45

Indicator 12: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted). 46

Indicator 13: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. 47

Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. 48

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

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

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

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(2271 in early intervention) ÷ (2381 with IFSPs)] times 100 = 95.4

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2006</i>	100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
<i>FFY 2006</i>	95.4% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs received the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

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

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: OSEP’s March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR data that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1). The data in the FFY 2005 APR show 91% compliance.

The State did not report data regarding the number of delays due to documented exceptional family circumstances. If the State collects these data and wishes to include them in the measurement, the number of children for whom the timeline was not met due to documented exceptional family circumstances would be included in both the numerator and the denominator of the measurement for this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, and the State must provide the specific numbers for its calculation.

CDS utilizes the recently developed Case-e system to collect and analyze data. Case-e is a statewide data system built upon our earlier system, ChildLink. It is very different in its current state from the original Childlink as it also captures fiscal data. All child data including IFSP/IEP data, demographics,

system supports, referrals, screenings, evaluations, team meetings, providers, is input at the site level. Initial planning for Case-e began in April of 2006, initial training was done in November of 2006 and the system was opened for use in January 2007 with data from Childlink brought into it. The system is a work in progress. The state level management team comprised of the human resources specialist, the business manager, the data manager, and the state director, review progress towards final development at weekly meetings. Included in our discussions are ongoing training needs for the sites as we continue our work on the system. This training will result in the availability of more specific data to meet our ongoing needs for reporting. This will impact the quality of our future data and next year's APR.

Case-e has the capacity for standard reports, compliance reports, and user created reports. Our fiscal department audits data in the system as they enter and check vendor bills for the sites against service data input by the sites. The invoice and payment modules of the system are centralized and audited by our outside auditors annually. Our monitoring consultant further verifies data in the system during site monitoring visits. There is ongoing correspondence between sites and the state level consultants for monitoring, data, and fiscal. Site volunteers have piloted various facets of the program's development to assure stakeholder input into the finished product. 31 trainings occurred during the 2006-2007 year. The data personnel at the state office offer technical assistance daily.

Unmet needs are reported by all sites monthly to the state data analyst. They are also reflected in the board minutes for the regional sites and included in our monitoring file review data.

The numbers that are reported for Indicator 1 reflect site reported data for unmet needs. The data are collected at each site by their own methods. The data for children's unmet services are compared to services for all children who have services. The data include unmet needs related to family circumstances in both the numerator and the denominator; however it is not specifically identified in either. Four specific areas of need are isolated within the site reported data; physical, developmental, occupational, and speech therapy are identified and can be analyzed at the site level.

Our statewide data gathering includes the reasons for non-compliance. There is a drop down menu for site input to articulate the reason for unmet needs. Our reasons are family, systemic, or other (which is defined as snow days, natural disaster, catastrophic events we have no control over, etc.) Though the data for Indicator 1 is not taken directly from the data system we are moving in this direction. The ongoing and evolving development of the Case-e data system is increasing our ability to access even more of this causal information to support the data and to inform our needs.

We are moving to the entry of, and access to, more information in the data system to enrich our ability to provide more data for all areas of the next APR.

We are pleased that our performance increased from a 91% FFY05 to 95.4% FFY06. We laud this progress but continue to address delays. We are able to document that delays at the systemic level are primarily caused by a lack of employed or contracted personnel to serve children. Information attesting to this was supplied by the site directors on their last entitlement applications. Board representatives also share this at monthly state level advisory board meetings.

Some of our regional sites have implemented the Primary Service Provider (PSP) model as a means of facilitating services to more children utilizing the provider and employee resources they currently have. The PSP model is included in the newly revised Chapter 101 and has been reviewed in training with site personnel in ongoing training opportunities. The sites that have done this shared this concept at a training held January 2007 which was attended by teams from each of our 16 regional sites. The pilot sites are experiencing a positive reorganization of existing personnel according to the site directors and their pilot staff members. These sites employ personnel when possible to increase the site's use of available hours in critical service areas.

On January 24 and 31 2008, CDS state Training with providers included a session on the PSP model. CDS regional staff attended training in January 2008 as well and focused on best practices

to make this process work in each regional site given their inherent differences. Training for parents is scheduled for March/ April 2008. There is a continuing discussion in Maine about how to fund this model that we have found, through our pilots, to have excellent results. Our Maine Care system is not set up to support the model in a way that allows our private providers to successfully be partners in this endeavor. Our state monies have been level funded for two years. We struggle with this and will initiate conversations to discuss this further at the state level.

We initiated a web service for job openings on our central webpage so sites have access to statewide applicants which could increase the number of well trained personnel at each site. Regardless of our available personnel, our monitoring process involves training for current site personnel in a number of areas and is fostering site personnel awareness regarding the need for timeliness in the delivery of services to children. We are encouraged by the feedback we receive from the trainings and by the increased involvement and understanding on the part of our current regional personnel.

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

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1), including the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.

The Improvement Activities in the State Performance Plan have been reviewed. It is noted that there is no "X" denoted for the improvement activity "Build on outcomes from the first year's interactions with the site directors and providers and continue the development of policies and procedures to remove impediments to timely service." We respectfully request that an "X" be included for the years 06 and 07. The revised table is included below:

<i>Improvement Activities</i>	<i>Timelines</i>						<i>Resources</i>
	<i>FFY Year when activities will occur</i>						
	<i>05</i>	<i>06</i>	<i>07</i>	<i>08</i>	<i>09</i>	<i>10</i>	
The data collection system will be modified and specific guidelines for the reporting of the data will be created and CDS site staff trained. Other considerations include:	X						
• Collection of data for all services	X						
• The potential determination of a reasonable and enforceable numeric definition of timely within the full spectrum of our system	X						
• Further evaluation of why services are interrupted and the need for supplemental codes	X						
• Determination of the best format for feedback reports	X						
• Training and support of the sites	X						

<i>Improvement Activities</i>	<i>Timelines</i>						<i>Resources</i>
	<i>FFY Year when activities will occur</i>						
	<i>05</i>	<i>06</i>	<i>07</i>	<i>08</i>	<i>09</i>	<i>10</i>	
Notify CDS sites of the requirements and provide preliminary instruction related to the reporting of the data. Work with Site directors to remove any procedural impediments.	X						
Develop ways to classify problems that affect service delivery.	X						
Develop policies for the CDS sites that standardize service delivery practices.	X						
<p>State of Maine’s Commissioner of the MDOE has authorized a number of initiatives that focus attention on delivery of services. Though not originally focused on the indicators of the SPP, some of the initiatives work toward the same goal, timely delivery of services</p> <p>A sub-group of CDS site directors and representatives of Maine’s community of contracted providers meets regularly to help stay aligned with their combined task of providing services for Maine’s children in need. They will continue to look for ways to assure the timely delivery of services.</p>	X						
During the development of the SPP, one of the largest stakeholders in the process, the Maine Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (MACECD) has taken a strong interest in this indicator and will be focusing its resources to assist with the development of an effective delivery system.	X						
CDS Central Office staff has been working closely with the State’s MaineCare division to clarify and refine payment policies that impact children ages 0-2. This work will continue.	X						

<i>Improvement Activities</i>	<i>Timelines</i>						<i>Resources</i>
	<i>FFY Year when activities will occur</i>						
	<i>05</i>	<i>06</i>	<i>07</i>	<i>08</i>	<i>09</i>	<i>10</i>	
Modify and distribute the updated electronic data collection forms and train CDS site staff in their use.	X						
Collect and analyze submitted data.		X					
Review annual targets.		X					
Use the formula prescribed in “Measurement” above to calculate the actual percent of children who received services in a timely manner.		X					
Build on outcomes from the first year’s interactions with site directors and providers to continue the development of policies and procedures to remove impediments to timely service.		X	X				
Continue ongoing data collection, evaluation and review of active IFSPs.			X				
Monitor compliance status through quarterly reports.			X				
Develop strategies to eliminate known reasons for delays in service delivery.			X				
Evaluate active IFSPs quarterly.			X				
Review the goals of this indicator and reevaluate all facets of data delivery and current practices to assure alignment.				X			
Modify the system as needed.				X			
Review targets.				X			
Utilize procedures developed and refined in the prior years for ongoing monitoring.					X	X	
Continue to provide strategies and assistance for meeting the 100% targets.					X	X	

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

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.
Percent = [(866 typically developing) ÷ (1023 with IFSPs)] time 100 = 85

FFY 2006	Measurable and Rigorous Target
	91% of infant and toddlers will be served in the home or programs for typically developing children.
FFY 2006	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
	85% of infant and toddlers were served in the home or programs for typically developing children.

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

OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.

It is also important that the State monitor to ensure that IFSP teams make individualized decisions regarding the settings in which infants and toddlers receive early intervention services, in accordance with Part C natural environment requirements.

The Case e system has settings data from the 618 setting table for December 1, 2006 which is monitored to assure natural environment i.e. home or community settings. DOE/CDS trainings occurred in the spring of 2007 for parents, providers, and staff and included clarification and discussion of natural environment settings for children as well as strategies to assure children are served in their home or community setting. Additionally, the Assistant Attorney General for Education initiated Lunch and Learn training opportunities for CDS regional site staff to discuss Part C, natural environment, and the strategies mentioned above. All sites receive training in Part C when their site is monitored. The CDS State Director was a member of the Department of Education IDEA Team which engaged in focused discussions with stakeholders as part of the development of Chapter 101.

Additionally, CDS state personnel provide individual tech assistance to providers and site personnel regarding setting questions. Information from these activities is utilized as an integral part of the development of the case e system.

Data personnel in the reporting sites continue to receive regular professional development. There have been 31 webinars for Case E for the data segments alone as well as ongoing discussions with users as modules of the program are created, piloted, and revised. The Case E developers presented twice annually to our state level advisory board in 2006-07 and continue to do so this year. The state director present informational updates to our state advisory board for B-20 (MACECD) at their monthly meetings. This supports the connection of the Case-E system to APR reporting and public awareness.

The CDS State IEU encourages sites to recruit and retain qualified providers to assure services are available in all communities and rural regions. A review of site personnel indicated a need to encourage regional boards to focus on this. [Administrative Letter #7](#) was sent out in January of 2008 which ramps up the expectations of employed personnel with the ability to commit resources at the regional level.

[Maine's Unified Regulations Chapter 101](#), Section X specifically articulates the federal language about provision of services in natural environments. Representative site directors were included in the year of revision work leading to the Unified Regulations--this supported a consistent back and forth from the state to sites encompassing input from the sites and output from the regulation team explaining and supporting natural environment and the intent of IDEA 2004. As we developed the FAQ for the regulations, clarification was further provided on any CDS issues included in the FAQ.

Maine DOE/CDS personnel participated in statewide trainings for parents, providers, and personnel which included the federal intent of this language.

Our data systems analyst reviews the Case E data on a continuing basis. This new statewide system allows the analyst to have current information from all programs, at all times, based on continuous and timely input provided at the site level regarding individual IFSP information. This information is shared with state level monitoring and finance personnel for use as they review files and fiscal documents. This allows the state director to have a current view of each site's progress in this area. We are continuing, through all of our systemic change, to work with sites and providers to ensure services and to understand the importance of service provision in the natural environment to the extent appropriate. As of December 2007, the child record audit form utilized for site monitoring was modified to allow a data point to check for service delivery in the natural environment as well as justification when it does not occur. Also, during site monitoring visits, we review to ensure that IFSP teams are making individualized decisions regarding the settings in which infants and toddlers receive early intervention services, in accordance with Part C natural environment requirements. This form, with modifications, was sent to OSEP in December 2007.

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

Baseline data for FFY2004 was not specifically stated in the Baseline Data section, but implied in the graph data presented. The sentence "The percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children in FFY2004 is 87% (58% + 29%)." was added to clarify the baseline.

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

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 3: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

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

(20 USC 1416(a) (3) (A) and 1442)

Measurement:	
A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	2 did not improve ÷ 13 assessed times 100 = 15
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	4 improved little ÷ 13 assessed times 100 = 31
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	3 improved nearer ÷ 13 assessed times 100 = 23
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	2 improved same ÷ 13 assessed times 100 = 15
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	2 maintained ÷ 13 assessed times 100 = 15
a + b + c + d + e = 13, the total number of children with two assessments.	

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):	
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	4 did not improve ÷ 13 assessed times 100 = 31
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	5 improved little ÷ 13 assessed times 100 = 38
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	2 improved nearer ÷ 13 assessed times 100 = 15
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	0 improved same ÷ 13 assessed times 100 = 0
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	2 maintained ÷ 13 assessed times 100 = 15
a + b + c + d + e = 13, the total number of children with two assessments.	
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	2 did not improve ÷ 13 assessed times 100 = 15
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	2 improved little ÷ 13 assessed times 100 = 15
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	1 improved nearer ÷ 13 assessed times 100 = 8
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	4 improved same ÷ 13 assessed times 100 = 31

e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.	4 maintained ÷ 13 assessed times 100 = 31
a + b + c + d + e = 13, the total number of children with two assessments.	

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Maine is using the Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI) or the Bayley III to assist in gathering information necessary to report on the three child outcomes stated above. The BDI and the Bayley are being used to help determine eligibility as well as to measure progress. The system is described in more detail below.

Description of the outcome measurement system for Maine:

The outcome measurement system for Maine includes:

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

Each of these elements is described below:

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

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

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

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, standardized instruments, and clinical judgment. It is recommended that observations to document areas of strength and areas that are of concern for the child should be made in his or her natural environment. This is the setting within the community where infants and toddlers without disabilities are usually found (e.g., home, child care, play groups)

MDOE has developed a process for data collection procedures. The service coordinator is responsible for collecting enough information to determine the early childhood outcomes rating for the child (on a scale of 1-7 on the child outcomes summary form) and the ECT team will review the existing data on the child at the ECT meeting. The information gathered at the ECT 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 IFSP or to transition from Part C to Part B 619. 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:

Staff from the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Center and the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC) conducted a training of 16 CDS teams (one team from each office) on January 22nd and 23rd, 2007. This training covered the new IFSP and the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF). Teams will be trained to collect information for the COSF and to reliably complete the COSF form. To ensure the information from the training was received and to ensure people are producing reliable data, regional trainings will also occur in May of 2007.

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

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

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

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

Baseline Data: Assessment at Entry

	A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills:	C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:
2005 (2005-2006)	13% 10 out of 75 children are age-appropriate at entry	28% 21 out of 75 children are age-appropriate at entry	19% 14 out of 75 children are age-appropriate right now

Progress Data FFY2006:

CDS has been involved in the utilization of the Child Outcomes Summary Form to document this area since 2005. Three pilot sites were initially involved in this process. They met with and reported to the CDS Early Childhood consultant. The work that they were engaged in resulted in the decision that Maine would use the ECO Center’s Child Outcomes Summary Form. Effective April 1, 2007, the Department-approved Child Outcome Summary Form (COSF) must be utilized by service provider teams throughout the state at all sites to measure child outcomes. This directive, documented in Administrative Letter #2 generated at the State IEU level, was based in part on the success of three local CDS Sites in producing outcomes data for the Annual Performance Report (APR) that was submitted to the U.S. Department of Education February 2007. [Administrative Letter #2](#) clearly delineated the reason for these changes, and

the steps to be taken by regional sites to meet the state’s requirements. It articulates who is to be assessed and when. The letter also ensures that procedures and policies for IFSP meetings regarding the use of COSF will be consistent. [Administrative Letter #1](#) which went out to sites March 16, 2007 required the use of the Bayley or the Battelle by evaluation and assessment teams for Part C children. Sites are not required to use it for the COSF though many do use it for their data points. They are allowed choice at this time for their instrument of choice. Data forms from the sites are sent to the state for input into the data system. For FFY06, we had data available only primarily from the pilot sites as the other sites did not initiate the process until April 1,2007. For the data above, the N of 13 is representative of this small group which we generated from the pilots and others in that timeframe. We only generated assessments on new children and only 13 of them left within a year after a minimum of 6 months in the program. For FFY07 we will have a much larger “n” as we will have a full year’s worth of COSFs. An additional person has been added at the state level to assist with input and monitoring of the data from the COSFs.

The state IEU provided training for CDS regional teams in the use of the COSF on January 23, 2007. Each team was required, as part of the training, to develop an action plan for their site’s progress towards the use of the COSF. The action plans were sent to the state IEU. Regional training opportunities for follow up and discussion of progress on their plan were provided in April/May 2007. At these follow ups, the sites shared successes and challenges.

We imbedded this indicator as one of the areas in our annual approval agreement with each site.

The CDS state IEU revised our monitoring procedures document in December 2007 to ensure that there is documentation in files of COSF utilization in accordance with [Admin Letter #2](#). Our monitoring consultant met with data personnel to make sure that the information we are gathering and supporting at sites correlates with indicator 3.

FFY 2006	Progress Data for FFY 2006		
	A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills:	C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:
did not improve functioning	15%	31%	15%
improved functioning but not nearer	31%	38%	15%
improved functioning to a level nearer	23%	15%	8%
improved functioning to comparable	15%	0%	31%
maintained functioning	15%	15%	31%

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

Who was included in the measurement?

All Children for whom the initial IFSP was completed after July 1, 2006 who are ages 0 through 2 years and who receive services for at least six months before exiting the program will be included in the

measurement. Data collected was phased in with three sites in 2006; all sites will come on board starting in April 2007. We used lessons learned from the phase in to determine an appropriate training and technical assistance system to help people make the necessary changes to begin data collection.

Data collected to acquire the entry data was phased in with three sites in 2006; all sites will come on board starting in April 2007. Sampling will no longer be done.

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

Approved assessment measures, observation, informed clinical judgment and information provided by the family will be used to inform the rating in each of the three outcome areas. The Childhood Outcomes Summary Form (COSF), which summarizes each child's level of functioning in each of the three outcome areas in relation to typically developing peers, will be used. The service coordinator will be responsible for collecting the information necessary and completing the COSF form. At the training for all sites, it was recommended that the COSF form be filled out at or immediately after the ECT meeting with the IFSP team. Again, the rating will be based on existing data on the child which includes evaluations (Batelle or Bayley), information provided by the parents of the child, and observations by caregivers as well as other service providers.

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

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

When will measurement occur?

Outcome ratings will be discussed and determined at or near child's entry into the CDS system. Subsequent assessments, which will be conducted annually, at or near the child's exit from Part C, will provide a second data point. Comparison of the two scores will provide baseline data.

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

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

How will data be analyzed?

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

- a) Percent of children who did not improve functioning;
- b) Percent of children who improved functioning but not 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 by CDS site and by State, the entry status of children, exit status, and the percentages of children who increased ratings from entry data to exit data (moved nearer to typical development).

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Following training on how to collect data for and complete the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) in June 2006, three pilot sites began collecting data. COSF forms were completed on 75 children between July 2006 and December 2006. This represents all the children who entered the CDS system in the three pilot sites during the mentioned time period. Following the training in January of 2007, all sites will begin to collect entry as well as progress data on all children entering the CDS system.

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

Discussion of Progress Data:

The State must provide progress data and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.

OSEP’s March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to clarify in the FFY 2005 APR whether or not it was using a sampling methodology to collect data. The State informed OSEP in the SPP that a sampling method would no longer be used to collect data for this indicator. The revised SPP reflects the new approach for collecting the required data.

CDS has been involved in the utilization of the Child Outcomes Summary Form to document this area since 2005 through pilot sites. Effective April 1, 2007, the Department-approved Child Outcome Summary Form (COSF) must be utilized by service provider teams throughout the state at all sites to measure child outcomes. This decision, documented in an administrative letter generated at the State IEU level, was based in part on the success of three local CDS Sites in producing outcomes data for the Annual Performance Report (APR) that was submitted to the U.S. Department of Education February 2007. Our administrative Letter #2 clearly delineated the reason for these changes, and the steps to be taken by regional sites to meet the state’s requirements. The letter also ensures that procedures and policies for IFSP meetings regarding the use of COSF will be consistent. Data forms from the sites are sent to the state for input into the data system. An additional person has been added at the state level to assist with input and monitoring of this

CDS state provided training for CDS regional teams in the use of the COSF on January 23, 2007. Regional training opportunities for follow up and discussion were provided in April/May 2007.

Maine

We imbedded this indicator as one of the areas in our annual approval agreement with each site. CDS state office revised our monitoring procedures document in December 2007 to ensure that there is documentation in files of COSF utilization in accordance with Admin Letter #2 data. Our monitoring consultant met with data personnel to make sure that the information we are gathering and supporting at sites correlates with indicator 3.

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	<i>FFY Year when activities will occur</i>						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
The Battelle II was piloted at three sites (Waterville, Bangor, and Androscoggin)	X						
ECT procedures and policies will be reviewed across CDS sites for consistency.		X					
January 2007 on Child Outcomes Summary Form							
All sites will use the COSF		X	X	X	X	X	
Current data systems will be modified to capture, aggregate, and report the data by site.		X					
A training and professional development system related to the child outcome assessment system will be developed and implemented.		X	X				
Continuing assessment of the data collection system			X	X	X	X	
Continuing training and professional development			X	X	X	X	

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

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 4: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

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

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

Measurement:	
A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.	199 know rights ÷ 261 families times 100 = 76
B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.	222 communicate effectively ÷ 261 families times 100 = 85
C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.	230 services helped ÷ 261 families times 100 = 88

	Measurable and Rigorous Target		
<i>FFY 2006</i>	A. Know their rights	B. Effectively communicate their children's needs	C. Help their children develop and learn
	86%	86%	86%
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006		
<i>FFY 2006</i>	76%	85%	88%

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

The State provided baseline data, targets, and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.

OSEP’s March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to clarify in the February 1, 2007 APR whether or not they were using a sampling methodology to collect data. The State informed OSEP in the revised SPP that a census method is being utilized to collect data for this indicator.

A mail survey is sent to parents of all CDS children each year. The results indicated that parents of boys were underrepresented in this initial survey. Data indicate that 58% of respondents were parents of boys whereas the percentage of boys in the Part C population is 69%. Hence scores were weighted to correct for this sampling bias.

As part of the part C monitoring process, each site’s parent survey is included in the final report of findings. The information gathered during the survey indicates performance in each of the areas of indicator 4. Performance in this area has also been assessed and examined during the on-site monitoring visits since May of 2007. Parental input is assessed as part of the child record audit form for Part C file reviews. The file review also assesses how and when parents are provided copies and information about their parental rights. Training at the individual sites has occurred to ensure that parents understand their rights, they have sufficient ability to communicate their children’s needs and help their children develop and learn. This training is done by our site directors for their staff to support interactions with parents. Sites not meeting compliance in this area are expected to submit corrective action for improvement to be measured within a year’s time.

Trainings during the lunch and learn teleconferences and on-site for monitoring consistently support increased parent involvement in the process at all stages.

CDS state personnel participated in parent forums in May and November of 2007 to approximately 400 parents in conjunction with Maine Parent Federation and Maine Association of Administrators of Special Services. The forums provided information on federal rule changes and state policies. The CDS state IEU will continue to work with our parent groups to support increased numbers of returned surveys. An additional emphasis in this work will be to notify the groups that we have an underrepresentation of responses from parents of boys and enlist their assistance to encourage greater participation of the parents of boys and of all parents. Additionally, we will publish the results of the survey on our website. Our analysis of the results of this survey indicates we need to do further work with our sites to explain this survey process more clearly. Site personnel are not familiar with the survey or the content of it at the level the state IEU would like to see. We will add this topic to our Lunch and Learn series so we can discuss it with site directors and their staff.

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

Improvement Activities were reviewed and updated. ~~Several activities completed in FFY2005 were removed.~~ The revised table is included below.

<i>Improvement Activities</i>	<i>Timelines</i>						<i>Resources</i>
	<i>FFY Year when activities will occur</i>						
	<i>05</i>	<i>06</i>	<i>07</i>	<i>08</i>	<i>09</i>	<i>10</i>	
Modify the NCSEAM Early Intervention Part C survey by using the last 22 questions (Impact of Early Intervention Services on Your Family), and a 4 point scale rather than a six point scale with the options of never; rarely; often; always; and selected demographic questions. (See appendix.)	X						

<i>Improvement Activities</i>	<i>Timelines</i>						<i>Resources</i>
	<i>FFY Year when activities will occur</i>						
	<i>05</i>	<i>06</i>	<i>07</i>	<i>08</i>	<i>09</i>	<i>10</i>	
Pilot the survey instrument: CDS Cumberland; CDS Hancock and CDS Androscoggin	X						
In coordination with the pilot sites, MDOE will obtain contact information of all parents, foster parents, surrogate parents or guardians who comprise the current caseload of the site. The parents and guardians will be sent the survey with a return postage paid envelope to the Department of Education.	X						
Data entry will be done by a contracted agency.	X						
Data analysis will be done by MDOE OSS data analysts.	X						
Provide the survey in accessible modes including Braille, audio, and language translations.	X						
Revise the distribution and collection plan as necessary.	X						
Set baseline and in January 2007 project annual measurable and rigorous targets based on pilot survey results in January 2007.	X						
Develop statewide distribution and collection system based on information from the pilot.		X					
MDOE will analyze and interpret the data.		X	X				
Review the projected annual measurable and rigorous targets.		X	X				
Publish State and local results disaggregated by CDS site.		X	X	X	X	X	

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

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:

- A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and
- B. National data.

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

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions.

Percent = $87 \div 13683 * 100 = 0.64$ where similar states are at 0.95

B. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to National data.

Percent = $87 \div 13683 * 100 = 0.64$ where National data are at 1.04

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006	0.80% of the 0 to 1 population.
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
FFY 2006	0.64% of the 0 to 1 population.

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

OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.

The percentage of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs remained essentially the same as FFY2006 (a slippage of 0.01% from the 0.65% reported in FFY2005).

Review of Improvement strategies:

1. Review of our consultants findings and begin to implement recommended changes articulated in the SPP'

- Clarification of the purpose of and need for early intervention services has been enhanced with the initiation of the unified regulations.
- Public awareness has been increased with the updates to the CDS system web pages.
- Interactive trainings done in partnership with both the Maine Parent Federation and MADSEC on the new state regulations have increased understanding of our federal obligations in both the Part C program for infants and toddlers and in the Part B program for children 3-20.
- CDS State IEU staff have reviewed the referral sources for a number of years to better understand what the variations in sources have been. Some very focused meetings with providers in the spring of 2007 has increased the understanding of the eligibility criteria and processes for referral. In addition the Subcommittee to Study the Effectiveness and Efficiency of the CDS System recommended that the Department of Health and Human Services promulgate regulations to ensure referrals to the CDS system from the newborn hearing screening program, the birth defects registry, and the metabolic screening programs, as they were concerned about what appeared to be a low rate of referrals in the B-1 range.
- Maine has begun the revisions to the Interagency Agreement between the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Human Services which will specifically speak to referral protocols.
- The unmet needs reports from the CDS sites are showing greater provision of services in the 95-96% fairly consistently, with some sites even higher. The increased implementation of the primary service provider model may also allow the universe of providers to be utilized more effectively.
- Through both the monitoring done by Erica, weekly Lunch and Learns, and the Fall conference sponsored by MADSEC there has been an increased effort to provide staff development.

2. Continue to add to our Web Presence and other broad media campaigns.

- The Web is continuing to undergo updates and will include report cards for each IEU on both performance indicators and compliance areas.

3. Determine if the low identification rate is impacted by the eligibility criteria.

- The state has adopted revised regulations which has enhanced and clarified the process of informed clinical opinion. The regulations was adopted August 3, 2007 so it is too early to determine if this change will significantly change the B-1 identification rate at this time.

4. Develop and maintain communication with a selected group of states to compare methods and results.

- The State Director of CDS maintains conference call connections through NERRC and NECTAC with other Part C Coordinators.

5. Continue to solicit input and assistance from stakeholders.

- The Department participated in the Subcommittee to Study Effectiveness and Efficiency from July –December 2006 and worked with the Legislative Joint Committee on Education to ensure that the referral process for the other Department could be formalized through regulations.
- The CDS State IEU regularly participate with the Maine Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities.
- The Department of Education staff regularly attend the meetings of the Child Care Advisory Council.

6. Review and enhance the data system.
 - What began as ChildLink has been refined into the CaseE data system which has referral data elements.
7. Review the first year's data to compare referral sources and target low response agency to determine reasons for low response.
8. Incorporate any changes in eligibility criteria into the analysis of the rate of children with IFSPs.
 - As noted in the Revisions section above, the informed clinical opinion has been refined and clarified, but the adoption time frame is too new to determine implications of the change.

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

This indicator under A. requires Maine to examine our percentage compared to other states with similar (narrow, moderate, or broad) eligibility definitions. The original baseline data and discussion of the baseline in the State Performance Plan was based upon peers with "comparable population and a few socioeconomic characteristics." With the publication by OSEP in October 2007 of the states ranked by their definitions of developmental delay being narrow, moderate, or broad, Maine is providing a new set of states and their data for comparison.

Arizona	.60
Connecticut	1.23
D.C.	.59
Georgia	.45
Idaho	1.70
Maine	.63
Montana	.96
N. Dakota	1.92
Nebraska	.71
Nevada	.67
Oklahoma	1.26
Oregon	.67
S Carolina	.82
Tennessee	.70
Utah	.72

Average of this cohort = .95

National average = 1.04

A statement was made in the last paragraph of the discussion of the baseline that the state's criteria may be too liberal for the current economic climate. In actuality the state's definition has been determined to be narrow in the October 2007 ranking. The paragraph in the SPP has been replaced with a sentence indicating this change.

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

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:

- A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and
- B. National data.

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

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions.
Percent = $1023 \div 40805 * 100 = 2.51$ where similar states are at 2.03

B. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to National data.
Percent = $1023 \div 40805 * 100 = 2.51$ where National data are at 2.43

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006	2.91% of the 0-2 population.
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
FFY 2006	2.51% of the 0 to 2 population.

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

OSEP’s March 15, 2006 SPP response letter informed the State that if it does not revise its eligibility criteria (as proposed in the SPP), it must revise its targets to reflect improvement.

The State did not change its eligibility criteria and revised its targets for this indicator to show improvement from its baseline. OSEP accepts those revisions.

The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.

The percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs slipped from 2.89% to 2.51% for reasons discussed below and in the discussion of targets in the next section.

Review of Implementation strategies:

1. Review of our consultants findings and begin to implement recommended changes articulated in the SPP'
 - Clarification of the purpose of and need for early intervention services has been enhanced with the initiation of the unified regulations.
 - Public awareness has been increased with the updates to the CDS system web pages.
 - Interactive trainings done in partnership with both the Maine Parent Federation and MADSEC on the new state regulations have increased understanding of our federal obligations in both the Part C program for infants and toddlers and in the Part B program for children 3-20.
 - Maine has begun the revisions to the Interagency Agreement between the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Human Services which will specifically speak to referral protocols.
 - The unmet needs reports from the CDS sites are showing greater provision of services in the 95-96% fairly consistently, with some sites even higher. The increased implementation of the primary service provider model may also allow the universe of providers to be utilized more effectively.
 - Through both the monitoring done by Erica, weekly Lunch and Learns, and the Fall conference sponsored by MADSEC there has been an increased effort to provide staff development.
2. Continue to add to our Web Presence and other broad media campaigns.
 - The Web is continuing to undergo updates and will include report cards for each IEU on both performance indicators and compliance areas.
3. Determine if the identification rate is impacted by the eligibility criteria.
 - The state has adopted revised regulations which has enhanced and clarified the process of informed clinical opinion. The regulations was adopted August 3, 2007 so it is too early to determine if this change will significantly change the identification rate at this time.
4. Develop and maintain communication with a selected group of states to compare methods and results.
 - The State Director of CDS maintains conference call connections through NERRC and NECTAC with other Part C Coordinators.
5. Continue to solicit input and assistance from stakeholders.
 - The Department participated in the Subcommittee to Study Effectiveness and Efficiency from July –December 2006 and worked with the Legislative Joint Committee on Education to ensure that the referral process for the other Department could be formalized through regulations.
 - The CDS State IEU regularly participate with the Maine Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities.
 - The Department of Education staff regularly attend the meetings of the Child Care Advisory Council.
6. Review and enhance the data system.
 - What began as ChildLink has been refined into the CaseE data system which has referral data elements.
7. Review the first year's data to compare referral sources and target low response agency to determine reasons for low response.

8. Incorporate any changes in eligibility criteria into the analysis of the rate of children with IFSPs.
- As noted in the Revisions section above, the informed clinical opinion has been refined and clarified, but the adoption time frame is too new to determine implications of the change.

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

This indicator under A. requires Maine to examine our percentage compared to other states with similar (narrow, moderate, or broad) eligibility definitions. As in Indicator #5 's case and now Indicator #6 the original baseline data and discussion of the baseline in the State Performance Plan was based upon peers with "comparable population and a few socioeconomic characteristics." With the publication by OSEP in October 2007 of the states ranked by their definitions of developmental delay being narrow, moderate, or broad, Maine is providing a new set of states and their data for comparison.

Arizona	1.81
Connecticut	3.41
D.C.	1.4
Georgia	1.26
Idaho	2.77
Maine	2.42
Montana	1.94
N. Dakota	3.11
Nebraska	1.74
Nevada	1.36
Oklahoma	1.97
Oregon	1.80
S Carolina	1.98
Tennessee	1.67
Utah	1.84

Cohort Average 2.03
National Average 2.43

In the State Performance Plan submitted February 2007 the discussion of baseline data reflected that Maine's identification rate was below the median of the peer group but higher than the rate for the US as a whole. In reality when you examine the cohort group by type of eligibility criteria ranking Maine is actually higher than most of the cohort group, with the exceptions of Connecticut, North Dakota and Idaho and is .01% less than the national average per the www.ideadata.org web listings. The cohort average is 2.03 which Maine is above.

Given this new data Maine would respectfully request that the targets for FFY 2007 be changed to 2.43%.

A statement was made in the last paragraph of the discussion of the improvement activities that the state's criteria may be too liberal for the current economic climate. In actuality the state's definition has been determined to be narrow in the October 2007 ranking. The paragraph has been changed to indicate the new ranking.

The CDS State IEU has updated the System's website during 2006-2007 year. The adoption of a unified special education regulation birth to age twenty in August 2007 provides clarity on the implementation of the federal statute and regulations to parents and providers in the field.

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

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline.

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

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed)] times 100.

Percent = [(1456 eligible) / (1599 assessed)] times 100 = 91

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006	100% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs had an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline.
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
FFY 2006	91% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs had an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline.

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

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: OSEP’s March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR data that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a).

The State did not report data regarding the number of delays due to documented exceptional family circumstances. If the State collects these data and wishes to include them in the measurement, the number of children for whom the timeline was not met due to documented exceptional family circumstances would be included in both the numerator and the denominator of the measurement for

this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, and the State must provide the specific numbers for its calculation.

Specific numbers for the calculation of this indicator are included in the Measurement box above. Data are included in the table below to show the range of compliance by CDS site.

Site	0-2 w/IFSPs	In Compliance	OOC All	OOC 45 Days - Family	OOC 45 Days - Systemic	OOC 45 Days - Other	% In Compliance
1	71	60	12	2	7	3	84%
2	284	267	17	7	6	5	94%
3	166	151	15	3	7	5	91%
4	38	37	0	0	0	0	99%
5	40	38	2	1	1	0	96%
6	70	60	10	2	8	0	85%
7	39	37	2	1	2	0	94%
8	57	53	3	2	2	0	94%
9	109	96	13	2	11	0	88%
10	92	82	10	5	4	0	90%
11	100	98	2	0	1	0	98%
12	74	68	7	2	4	1	91%
13	139	121	17	4	13	0	87%
14	39	37	2	0	2	0	96%
15	44	41	3	1	1	1	94%
16	239	210	29	12	17	0	88%
All Sites	1599	1456	143	43	84	15	91%

OOC = Out of Compliance

$$\% \text{ In Compliance} = \frac{(\text{In Compliance} + \text{OOC 45 Days - Family})}{(\text{0-2 w/IFSP} + \text{OOC 45 Days - family})}$$

Delays in completing evaluations: Family reasons include lack of timely response, sickness and other issues that may prevent the family and CDS from moving forward to a timely evaluation. Systemic and other reasons vary across the Sites and are tracked in records at the individual CDS Sites; they include loss of service providers, relocation of children from one CDS site to another, or a shortage of service providers in a specialty.

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

June 15, 2007 Response Letter: The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR that

demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a), including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.

The following improvement activities have been added to the SPP:

1. The Professional Development Committee for CDS developed and implemented training in general assessment principles, the use of the Battelle II in determining eligibility, and transdisciplinary teaming to CDS employees and providers. Continuing professional development is occurring in 2007-08 for providers, parents, and CDS employees.
2. Since refining the data codes, implementing system wide training on the new codes and beginning to pilot some of the recommendations of the Assessment Committees, sites have already seen reductions in the non-compliance with the 45 day timeline.
3. Ongoing monitoring of the rates of compliance will inform the necessary training and technical assistance or data management adjustments that are required at the site level to maintain acceptable.
 - The CDS State IEU reviews the compliance reports site by site on a monthly basis.
 - The Monitoring consultant reviews the compliance reports before going to do both the on-site training before the monitoring visit and the on site file review.
 - During 2006-2007 and ongoing, the State IEU reviews the monthly monitoring reports to determine the impact of the implementation of the department approved Bayley and Battelle II assessments universally. On site monitoring checks for this as well.

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

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Indicator 8: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

- A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;
- B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and
- C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

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

Measurement:	
A. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100.	(87 with plans ÷ 127 exiting) * 100 = 69
B. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.	(127 with notification ÷ 127 potentially eligible) * 100 = 100
C. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.	(110 with conference ÷ 127 potentially eligible) * 100 = 87

<i>FFY 2006</i>	Measurable and Rigorous Target		
	IFSPs with transition steps and services	Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B	Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B
	100%	100%	100%
FFY 2006	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:		
	69%	100%	87%

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

8a. OSEP’s March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include, in the FFY 2005 APR, data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006) that meet the required measurements for Indicator 8A.

The State did not provide any data for FFY 2005 in response to Indicator 8A. However, the State indicated that it has implemented a new form to include the required information, and that a new data system is being developed to provide data for this indicator. The State also indicated that data collection from the new forms was expected to begin in March 2007.

The State must provide the required data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 to demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h).

In FFY 2005, the state had no data for this indicator because children birth to age five receive services in the same system (Child Development Services, abbreviated CDS) so the collection of data on either side of age three was not done. In response to the OSEP letter in June of 2007, a focused, in-depth site monitoring of transition activities occurred with the CDS sites before June 30th. The results of the monitoring were used in the data tables provided. 10% of files were reviewed at the sites for compliance with Part C transition. This process was done both on-site and by internal audit. For the transition steps requirement, 127 files were reviewed for compliance; 87 files met compliance for a rate of 69% compliance. The two pilot sites performed significantly higher than the others in transition planning and conferences. Training began for all of the sites in July 2007 based upon the findings of the monitoring.

Each site developed and was using different IFSP forms during this reporting period. Not all versions contained transition steps. The IFSP to be used by Maine’s 16 CDS sites was developed as a draft in the year 2005 – 2006 year with technical assistance from NECTAC with stakeholder input from various trainings. Two CDS sites implemented the new form as pilot sites over the course from February 2006 through December 2006 and provided critical input which was utilized by the team from CDS and NECTAC to create a workable final product. In January of 2007, state wide training occurred to review the newly developed Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) for children birth up until age three receiving early intervention services through the CDS system. The training included the new IFSP form and guidance handbook. The training which included individuals from NECTAC, the pilot sites and the State IEU, focused on IFSP Process Overview – Principles and Steps; Family Assessment – Family Routines and Priorities; Conducting a Functional Initial Evaluation and Assessment for Eligibility Determination and IFSP Development; Eligibility Determination and the IFSP Meeting; Developing IFSPs: Functional Outcomes and Strategies that Support Evidence-Based Practices in Natural Learning Environments; Guided Practice - Writing Functional Outcomes. In the development of the IFSP, and in training, specific attention was made to the Part C transition planning and conference for children and families with two specific pages of the IFSP dedicated to this area. The sites that adopted the new State IFSP addressing transition steps and services in the spring of 2007 are marked with * in the table below. The sites using the new State IFSP addressing transition steps and services hold a higher level of compliance than most of the other sites.

SITE	Files reviewed	Files meeting compliance	% of compliance
04	9	0	0%
06	7	3	43%
11*	35	30	86%
10	10	6	60%
05 *	17	16	94%
01	3	2	67%
07	2	0	0%

SITE	Files reviewed	Files meeting compliance	% of compliance
15	5	2	40%
12	5	2	40%
08	4	4	100%
02	23	18	78%
09	7	4	57%
Total	127	87	69%

8b. OSEP’s March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include, in the FFY 2005 APR, data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006) that meet the required measurements for Indicator 8B.

OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate continued compliance with the requirements in 303.148(b)(1).

The transitions from Part C to Part B are handled all within the same “LEA”. Children at age three continue to be served by the CDS system, almost always in the same site. There is notification but not in the sense of a separate LEA.

8c. OSEP’s March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include, in the FFY 2005 APR, data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006) that meet the required measurements for Indicator 8C.

The State did not submit any data for this indicator. However, the State indicated that it has implemented a new form to include the required information, and that a new data system is being developed to provide data for this indicator. The State also indicated that data collection from the new forms was expected to begin in March 2007.

New forms were implemented as planned and file reviews were performed during focused monitoring of 12 CDS sites. 127 files were reviewed for transition meeting compliance, 110 files met compliance for a rate of 87% compliance. Data from the review of individual site is shown in the table below.

SITE	Files reviewed	Files meeting compliance	% of compliance
04	9	9	100%
06	7	6	86%
11	35	31	89%
10	10	10	100%
05	17	16	94%
01	3	3	100%
07	2	2	100%
15	5	2	40%
12	5	2	40%
08	4	4	100%
02	23	18	78%
09	7	7	100%
Total	17	110	87%

In September of 2007, the IFSP was adopted by the State as a mandatory form and sites received additional training on the form and the importance of compliance with Part C transition planning

activities and timelines. Additional training has taken place during weekly teleconferences, the October 2007 Fall MADSEC training and on-site visits to the sites. In January of 2008, further training in this area was provided to providers in two locations in the state. Parent training on transition is scheduled for February and March of 2008.

During on-site monitoring of the CDS sites, sites are monitored for compliance in meeting the specific transition areas indicated in indicator #8. Since June 2007, seven CDs sites have undergone on-site monitoring. Two more have received the initial training in preparation for their on-site visit. The goal is to visit each remaining CDS site by June 2008. Corrective action plans must be submitted to correct the areas of non-compliance within one year of the receipt of the letter of findings. Sites are establishing policies and guidance documents for their staff to ensure timeliness of transition occurs for children exiting Part C services.

Improvements have been made in the collection of the data entered into the CASE-E data management system to measure compliance in the area of transition. Data points are being collected as the new IFSPs are entered into the system.

Significant efforts have been put forth to bring attention to compliance with transition planning and conferences since June of 2007. The results and impact on performance data will be reviewed in an ongoing manner by the state IEU during this current SPP APR year.

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

Maine reviewed its Improvement Activities and added activities focused on IFSP Process Overview – Principles and Steps; Family Assessment – Family Routines and Priorities; Conducting a Functional Initial Evaluation and Assessment for Eligibility Determination and IFSP Development; Eligibility Determination and the IFSP Meeting; Developing IFSPs: Functional Outcomes and Strategies that Support Evidence-Based Practices in Natural Learning Environments; and Guided Practice - Writing Functional Outcomes. These are training events extending the pilot work into all sites. The revised table is included below:

<i>Improvement Activities</i>	<i>Timelines</i>						<i>Resources</i>
	<i>FFY Year when activities will occur</i>						
	<i>05</i>	<i>06</i>	<i>07</i>	<i>08</i>	<i>09</i>	<i>10</i>	
Providing additional training to sites related to the transition process including the following protocols:	X						
• Notify the parent that transition will occur in the next 3 to 6 months.	X						
• Notify the local education agency (school district) that there will be an Early Childhood Team (ECT) meeting to address transition steps.*	X						
• Coordinate meeting date with family and school district.	X						

<i>Improvement Activities</i>	<i>Timelines</i>						<i>Resources</i>
	<i>FFY Year when activities will occur</i>						
	<i>05</i>	<i>06</i>	<i>07</i>	<i>08</i>	<i>09</i>	<i>10</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Send information to the family about special education eligibility at age 3. 	X						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proceed with steps to prepare the toddler and family for changes in service delivery. 	X						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide information about community resources. 	X						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the IFSP to document transition outcomes by age 3. 	X						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For a child whose first eligibility meeting is held after age 2 years, 6 months, the IFSP developed must include transition information. 	X						
<p>Monitor sites for compliance and verify data and data entry.</p>		X	X	X	X	X	<p>Based on findings, continue to provide ongoing professional development and trainings to enhance understanding and compliance.</p>
<p>Expanding the data collection system to include elements specific to transition including but not limited to the following transition steps:</p>		X	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The date of the final ECT meeting to review the IFSP for inclusion of transition needs, 		X	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The date of notification to the LEA, 		X	X				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Codified results of the meeting. The codes will provide references to special conditions encountered at the transition meeting in addition to the standard Part C Exit Codes. 		X	X				

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

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 9: 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) and 1442)

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 = **[(0) divided by (14)] times 100 = 0**

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2006	100%
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
FFY 2006	0%

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

OSEP June 15, 2007 Response: In the SPP submitted in December 2005, the State indicated that it was 100% compliant for Indicator 9, but it did not provide any data as to how it arrived at its 100% calculation and did not describe whether and what findings the State made as a result of its on-site monitoring of the 16 Child Development Services (CDS) visited during the summer of 2005. OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR data demonstrating compliance (i.e., data regarding findings identified during FFY 2004 and corrected during FFY 2005), including whether or not identified noncompliance was corrected within one year.

The State's FFY 2005 APR provides neither the required FFY 2005 data, or any narrative on whether, when or what findings the State made as a result of the 16 CDS monitoring on-site visits conducted during the summer of 2005. The State's FFY 2005 APR indicated only that it had conducted "monitoring visits in the summer of 2006" to identify areas of need but provided no details as to if, when and what findings were made. Although the State indicated in its September 2005 progress report that it had conducted monitoring of its 16 CDS sites and made corrections, it is unclear if the State is monitoring for compliance with Part C requirements, making findings as a result of monitoring, requiring corrective actions and ensuring timely correction of identified noncompliance.

In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must: (1) confirm that the State has made findings of noncompliance with Part C requirements; (2) provide a list of the findings made by CDS site; (3) describe the corrective actions required of each CDS site, and (4) report on data demonstrating compliance with the timely correction requirements in IDEA sections 616(a), 642, and 635(a)(10) and 34 CFR §303.501(b), including information regarding the correction of noncompliance identified by the State as a result of its on-site monitoring visits conducted during FFY 2005 and the summer of 2006.

In its response to Indicator 9 in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must disaggregate by APR indicator the status of timely correction of the noncompliance findings identified by the State during FFY 2005. In addition, the State must, in responding to Indicators 1 and 7, specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators. The State must also report on the correction of any noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 for Indicators 8A and 8C.

Child Development Services in Maine has undergone significant change as indicated at the beginning of this APR. A new state director was appointed to start effective July 17, 2006. A variety of issues were immediately evident due to centralization of functions from the regional sites to the State CDS IEU. The state director, with the assistance of a consultant, organized and articulated the areas that needed to be addressed and initiated activities to address the various needs. The work was presented to our Education Committee in April 2007 and the report for that committee was included in our introduction to this document.

One area of concern for the State IEU was to bring 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 site and the monitoring consultant over the course from July 2005 to the monitoring consultants departure in October of 2006 were limited in scope and compliance with federal requirements. A new monitoring and technical assistance consultant was hired and started work in late March of 2007. Limited information was available to the new consultant regarding available CAP data from previous monitoring activities. We recognized immediately that the vacant position and lack of cross training with any other state level personnel must be remediated. The consultant met with the 5-20 yr old Program monitoring consultant to build a new monitoring system for the CDS program and to ensure the system we developed could be overseen by the 5-20 if necessary. The description of the process is outlined below:

Child Development Services Program Monitoring Overview

Technical Assistance Visit

- **PRE-SITE INFORMATION PACKAGE**
 - Set Date and Schedule for On Site Technical Assistance Training

- Confirmation letter sent with information request
- Return Required Information
- Interviews by the Department of Education
 - Interviews will be conducted with site staff, providers, site board members, parents and community members
- **ON-SITE VISIT (1 day (3-hours))**
 - Technical Assistance Training for Staff and Site Directors
 - Orientation and Overview of Child record Audit form and the Program Monitoring Process
 - Process for Conducting Self-review Plan and Compliance Audit
 - File review with staff and site director using the Child Record Audit Form
 - Administration Presentation
 - Review Focus Monitoring Process
 - Data Summary from Key Performance Indicators on the State Performance Plan and Entitlement Plan
 - Parental Survey Results
 - Review of Self-review Plan and establish Timeline for completion
 - Schedule on-site Compliance Monitoring

Verification Visit

- **Pre-Site Review**
 - Submit Self-Review Plan to the Department
 - The Department will conduct interviews
- **ON-SITE verification Visit (2-3 days)**
 - Record review of a minimum of 10% of Part C files and 10% of Part B files requested by the Department
 - Exit Summary with Director/Selected Personnel of preliminary findings
- **LETTER OF FINDINGS**
 - Recommendations for Full Approval to Commissioner of Education
 - Required Sanctions and Interventions
 - Corrective Action Plan for Noncompliance to be completed within 3 months of findings or specified time frame
 - Local Improvement Plan for areas needing improvement

Follow-up

- **POST-SITE LETTER**
 - Completion of Corrective Action Plan/Letter of Approval/Sanctions

In May of 2007, Site 10 was the first site to undergo the new monitoring system. New Child Record Audit forms were developed and utilized during this process. Both quantitative and qualitative data was collected during the process. A Letter of findings was issued in July of 2007 and a corrective

action plan was submitted within the timeframes set forth in the letter of findings. The site is overseen by the state IEU. The state took responsibility for this site on December 8, 2003. Its governing board was changed to an advisory board at that time. When the new state director started in July 2006, this board was not functioning. She worked with them in the fall of 2006 to articulate their role as a functioning advisory board, and they are now an active advisory board. The State Director attends monthly advisory meetings with the board for this site. This allows direct flow of information from the state to this board and site director. The site director is leaving CDS in June 2008. A plan is in place to co-manage this site with two other sites. Plans for the efficient and timely merging of the administrative responsibilities for this site are underway. A focus of the plan is to convene the staff at this site to assist them to meet their action plan goals developed subsequent to the on site review. This site has been the receiver of 4 due process requests this year 1/Part C and 3/Part B. Issues of Due Process concern will be matched with the needs highlighted on their action plan to assure the state that this site is consistently striving and working towards progress on the indicators of the SPP. The transition of the site's leadership is scheduled to be initiated February 15, 2008.

As a result of the OSEP letter in June 2007, 12 sites were accessed for a focused monitoring for Indicator 8 prior to June 30, 2006 to ensure valid data for reporting in this APR.

The monitoring consultant reviewed the findings of Site 16 from an on-site review conducted in 2006 and determined the need to conduct another on-site review as part of the new process. Site 16 submitted a letter of dispute to findings in 2006 and did not submit an appropriate corrective action plan. An internal audit was conducted by the site staff and a site self review plan was submitted by the site director in early September of 2007. This information was reviewed and found to unacceptable and incomplete in its scope. An on-site review was held in Oct of 2007 with a letter of findings released in December of 2007 addressing the past issues from 2006 as well as the new compliance data found during the audit. Monitoring report is included in the appendix. The site has submitted all corrective action plans within the timeframes set forth in the letter of findings.

In addition to the monitoring consultants activities at Site 16, the State CDS director undertook significant general supervision at site 16 for other areas of concern. A letter was sent to the board in mid November 2007 requesting a meeting with the board to discuss a variety of Chapter 180/101 compliance issues, the Site 16 site director's conduct in relationship to the state IEU, and the hiring management of the site. On December 10, 2007, the CDS State Director Debra Hannigan, Deputy Commissioner Angela Faherty, and Assistant Attorney General Sarah Forster met with the site's Board to discuss the issues and to assist them to move towards a plan of action to address the concerns. The state IEU provided the services of an education consultant to the board. With the assistance of that individual, the board put measures in place to oversee more closely the daily activities and correspondence of the site director and they have revamped their EOE hiring practices. The plan of action to address the 180/101 violations was due January 25, 2008 and was received by the state office on time. Activity is currently underway to review and respond to that plan. Our monitoring consultant completed monitoring training activities with the site to assist them with their monitoring and completed extra training focused on the use of, and best practices with, the new state forms. Further training in many areas has been requested by the board and will be provided.

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 CAPs. Responses to the letters have been forthcoming. Over 50% of the sites provided documentation to support closure of their findings of corrective action. The consultant is currently following up with sites that have not responded in a timely manner. Additionally, ongoing assessment of performance in all areas is being conducted through site monitoring during this current year.

Since July 1, 2007, six full site audits have been completed and the letters of findings have been made public. Four of the sites have submitted their corrective action plan with activities to correct

areas of non-compliance within a year. Additionally, with ongoing input from OSEP, changes have been made to the monitoring process, including percentage used to measure compliance (80% to now 95%) and new child record audit forms that address Part C and Part B separately have been implemented into the monitoring process. The changed audit forms can be found in the appendix. Two more sites are in the beginning stages. A timeline is in place to complete all 16 sites by June 30, 2008 with a follow up process planned for 2009.

The state IEU is clear that our role as the DOE is to recognize noncompliance at each site and to address it with the regional sites. As a result, we as the state are increasing our vigilance in the oversight of the regional CDS sites and providing feedback and support to personnel and boards as appropriate. The regional sites are then expected to correct the noncompliance.

Through the use of the on-site and internal monitoring of data, surveys, and interview information collected at all of the sixteen sites, the State IEU is confident in moving forward with a consistent monitoring system that will meet the needs for federal compliance. The State IEU recognizes the need for a comprehensive Monitoring Manual to be completed by June of 2008. This will ensure consistency in process if future transitions occur with personnel. Cross training of monitoring is ongoing through the process as CDS site directors and staff are involved at all levels of the monitoring process. Updates on monitoring and the performance of the sites are reported monthly at the State level CDS advisory board as well as the MACED state level advisory board. We are increasing board involvement and understanding and support at the state and regional. Our findings throughout the implementation of increased monitoring and general supervision have resulted in topical Administrative letters, some of which have been referenced in this APR. The State IEU is confident that the follow up monitoring of sites starting in July of 2008 will result in improved compliance in all if not most areas as a result of the new monitoring process and technical assistance provided during 2007 and 2008. Our work is intended to be transparent and we welcome feedback from the sites and providers that serve our children.

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

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

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 10: 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) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.
 = [(0 + 0) ÷ 0] times 100 = N/A

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

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

One signed written complaint was resolved in mediation. No complaint investigation report was issued so the timeline measure cannot be calculated.

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

Improvement activities and timelines were revised to describe continuing oversight of complaint investigations and extensions. Those changes are included in the table below:

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

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

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 11: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.

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

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

<i>FFY 2006</i>	Measurable and Rigorous Target
	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.
<i>FFY 2006</i>	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
	No due process hearing requests during the FFY 2006

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

No hearings were requested during the FFY 2006 reporting period.

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

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

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 12: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

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

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.
 = (0 ÷ 0) times 100 = N/A

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2006</i>	0% of resolution sessions will result in settlement agreements
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
<i>FFY 2006</i>	No resolution sessions were held during the FFY 2006

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

No resolution sessions were held during the FFY 2006 reporting period. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more resolution meetings were held, but will continue to monitor for Part C resolution session activity using the Part B targets since the same dispute resolution system is used.

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

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

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 13: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.
= [(0 + 1) ÷ 1] times 100 = 100

<i>FFY 2006</i>	Measurable and Rigorous Target
	77% of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.
	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
<i>FFY 2006</i>	100% of mediations held resulted in mediation agreements.

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

One Part C mediation was held during FFY 2006. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more mediations were conducted, but will continue to monitor Part C mediation activity using the Part B targets since the same dispute resolution system is used.

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

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

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

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

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

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

Percent determined using the Data Scoring Rubric (included below) = 90.1

<i>FFY 2006</i>	Measurable and Rigorous Target
	100% of data submitted will be on time and accurate.
<i>FFY 2006</i>	Actual Target Data for FFY 2006
	90.1% of data submitted was on time and accurate.

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

OSEP’s March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to revise its targets in the FFY 2005 APR to indicate its intent to reach 100% timeliness and 100% accuracy regarding data reported in the APRs, as well as under section 618.

The State revised the SPP targets for this indicator as requested, and OSEP accepts those revisions.

Although the State reported 100% compliance for this indicator, OSEP’s review confirms that the State did not report any of the required FFY 2005 data in the APR for Indicators 8A, 8C, and 9.

The calculation of this indicator is described in the State Performance Plan (SPP) as [(number submitted on time and accurate) ÷ (number required to be submitted)] times 100. However, Maine used the Data Scoring Rubric for Part C – Indicator 14 to compile the data for this calculation; the table from the worksheet is inserted below. The data used in the scoring rubric are related to the quality of the FFY2006 APR submitted February 1, 2008 and the quality of the 618 data submissions for FFY2006 (tables submitted February 1, 2007 and November 1, 2007).

The resulting indicator score for indicator 14 is 93.9% for FFY2006.

SPP/APR Data - Indicator 14				
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Correct Calculation	Followed Instructions	Total
1	1	1	1	3
2	1	1	1	3
3	1	1	1	3
4	1	1	1	3
5	1	1	1	3
6	1	1	1	3
7	1	1	1	3
8a	1	1	1	3
8b	1	1	0	2
8c	1	1	1	3
9	0	0	0	0
10	1	1	1	3
11	1	1	1	3
12	1	1	N/A	2
13	1	1	1	3
			Subtotal	41
APR Score Calculation		Timely Submission Points - If the FFY2006 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.		5
		Grand Total - (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =		46

Part C indicator 8B data are valid and reliable and can be calculated overall, but presenting notification data by site was not possible for 2006-2007. Indicator 9 data have been collected in terms of the identification and notification of finding, but insufficient times has elapsed to evaluation sites' ability to correct non-compliance within the twelve month timeline.

618 Data - Indicator 14					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Table 1 - Child Count Due Date: 2/1/07	1	1	1	0	3
Table 2 - Program Settings Due Date: 2/1/07	1	1	1	0	3
Table 3 - Exiting Due Date: 11/1/07	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 4 - Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/07	1	1	1	N/A	3
				Subtotal	12
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 3) =		36

Indicator #14 Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	46
B. 618 Grand Total	36
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	82
Total NA or N/A in APR	0
Total NA or N/A in 618	0
Base	91
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*) =	0.901
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	90.1

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

The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in IDEA sections 616, 618 and 642, and 34 CFR §§303.176 and 303.540.

Revision/justification to Improvement Activities: Improvement strategies for the indicators that possessed data validity or reliability issues in the FFY2005 report were reviewed and modified as appropriate to improve data collection, analysis, reporting and verification.

FFY2006 Part C Annual Performance Report Appendix

Indicator Reference	Title/Description	Number of Pages
Overview	Chapter 662 Work Activities	12
4	Parent Survey – Part C	2
9	PART C CHILD RECORD AUDIT FORM	4
9	PART B CHILD RECORD AUDIT FORM	5
9	Monitoring Review Report – Part C	5
9	Monitoring Review Report – Part C	7
9	Monitoring Review Letter of Findings	7
10-13	TABLE 4 REPORT OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION UNDER PART C, OF THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT 2006-07	1

Chapter 662 Components	Activities
<p>1. Department of Education. The department shall serve as the lead agency for the Part C program fro young children birth through age two, and shall exercise general supervisory authority over child find and the provision of a free, appropriate public education to children at least 3 years of age and under 6 years of age. The commissioner or the commissioner’s designee is responsible for:</p>	
<p>A. Developing and adopting rules necessary to carry out the provisions of the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part B, Section 619 and Part C.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repeal and replace 180(B-5) and 101(5-20) with revised 101 (B-20)- In rule making process
<p>B. The department will approve local entitlement plans and budgets that are in compliance with the statewide standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revision of web based system for the applications completed fall 2006 • Applications due 1/30/07 • Review of apps with original budgets and re-run budgets occurring presently
<p>C. Ensuring legal and policy compliance throughout the early childhood special education program by reviewing or performing regular audits of program records;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distinguished Educator for monitoring and technical assistance at State CDS as of 3/26/07 • Review/Revise data gathering format • Coordinate audit form with IDEA 2004 and DOE 5-20 process • Re-design audit to include file review, personnel interview , parent input, and fiscal components • Coordinate teams • Set up schedule

<p>D. Ensuring fiscal compliance throughout the early childhood special education program by reviewing or performing regular audits of program records</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System-Wide Exit Conference Results of the 16 regional sites resulted in documentation of major items handled inconsistently <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Need compensating controls over Childlink (now Case-e) so management of the database and the processing of invoices is shared. 2. Payments for Missed Appointments. Chapter 180 does not allow payments for missed appointments. Inconsistently handled throughout State. 3. Providers not enrolled in Mainecare. These providers are used to get children off of waiting lists. However, documentation is lacking. Recommend that Site obtain short-term written contract with the provider documenting that once a Mainecare provider can be found, the children will be moved to the provider. Follow-up procedures need to be established for documentation. 4. Accounting Internal Controls <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Bank reconciliations not timely b. Subsidiary AP and AR ledgers not reconciled. Significant direct effect on monthly reports to State, unable to determine accurate balances. c. Medicaid billing not timely. d. Improperly dated checks e. Stale checks f. Timeliness of deposits g. Checks out of sequences, voids not accounted for h. Check stock unlocked i. Receivable collections not monitored j. Payroll issues
--	---

	<p>I-9, timesheet approvals, salaries paid differ from budget, stipends to staff</p> <p>k. Documentation Insurance Invoices Coding Provider Contract changes undocumented Mainecare eligibility IFSP Attendance records</p> <p>l. General ledger errors, no approvals on entries</p>
<p>E. Correction Action of Non-Compliance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corrective Action Plans will be completed as appropriate for the 16 sites as a result of monitoring process defined in 1C by June 2008 • Set follow up schedule
<p>2. State Level Advisory Committee is established for the period from July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007 to advise on the provisions of this section. Members of the State Level Advisory Committee are appointed by the commissioner and consists of representatives from regional boards that represent membership of the regional boards at §7209(5), the early childhood education consultant and the Director of Early Childhood Special Education within the Department of Education.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board representation from all sites supports communication • Monthly meetings • Agenda items based on Chapter 662 initiatives • State IEU Personnel provide updates re: central IEU activities in the following areas: fiscal, data, training, and HR • Board members provide input regarding: • Policy review and revision • Job Descriptions • Audit Findings • Legal Matters

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input to/from sites through this mechanism is important. State IEU encourages the committee's guidance. Policies have been reworded, as have job descriptions. Before we finalize anything of that magnitude that impacts sites, the Advisory Board has the opportunity to review and revise.
<p>3. State Intermediate Educational Unit. The Commissioner shall establish and supervise a state intermediate educational unit.</p>	
<p>A. Establish standard policies and procedures for a statewide human resource system, including personnel classifications, position descriptions, salary ranges, and a standard package of health, retirement and other fringe benefits for Child Development Services System personnel that shall be included in the annual entitlement plan described in section §7209, subsection 1 beginning in fiscal year 2006-07</p>	<p>Since 07/01/06, we have developed several statewide human resource policies, based on analysis of all 17 site practices, comparison to industry standards, state and federal law and benefits laws, with input from the Advisory Committee and Site Directors. The completed HR Policies include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDS Holidays • Telephone, Internet, Computer and Fax Use • Smoke-Free Workplace Policy • Paid Time Off • Site Office Hours & Office Closures • Employment Records & References • Overtime and Timekeeping • We presented to the Advisory Board and Site Directors 14 other Human Resource Policies and have gathered comments from Board Members and site directors. These are in the finalization stage • Policy work was slowed down due to a challenge from some sites to the AAG regarding our right to create policies despite the inclusion of this in 662, necessitating input from legal counsel for state CDS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entered into contract with John Gaudet, HR Solutions, to

write job descriptions, set position titles and assign appropriate salary ranges for many of the CDS jobs. John formed a team of Site Directors to create universal job descriptions that, once finalized, could fit into an appropriate salary range. Have created draft descriptions for

- Site Director
 - Developmental Therapist
 - Occupational Therapist
 - Physical Therapist
 - Service Coordinator
 - Speech Therapist
 - Class Room Teacher
- Job descriptions are being finalized at the State IEU for correlation to expectations , rule language, and certification requirements.
- For all descriptions, the committee requested and received feedback from employees currently in these positions. We are reviewing the comments on the Site Director and Admin Assist. Job descriptions at this time.
- John Gaudet researched and has created a “Market Analysis” which regionalizes each site and assigns salary ranges to the positions in each region. The salary ranges are derived from information received from the Maine Department of Labor Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates for Maine (2005) and Economic Research Institute (2007).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salary Scale delivered 3/07 • Salary scale currently under review to coordinate and verify with payroll records • Interim process utilized by state director from 7/17/06 to assist sites with salary assignment for new personnel based on consultation with John and HR/payroll records • Site directors met with the State Director on 8.2.06 and were informed that salary scales would be finalized in 3 to 4 months. In the meantime, a plan was put in place as mentioned above to deal with the outliers to bring them closer to the mean. This allows sites to bring on new people as needed • Delay in this activity is due to the need to consolidate 100 different job titles in place at the sites to ensure market analysis was correct. This verification continues. • The salary scales, job descriptions, and ability for individuals to prorationally fill more than one job description will be equitable and applied to each site.
<p>B.Develop a statewide human resource system and perform the human resource and payroll functions for Child Development Services System personnel;</p>	<p>A standardized health plan, life insurance, spouse life insurance plan, dependent life plan, short term disability, long term disability and flexible spending accounts introduced and explained during statewide site meetings during the months before the conversion date of 07/01/06. There were many steps in this process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centralized the administration of all benefits which eliminated inconsistencies at the sites

- Introduced one plan for each benefit line for the employees at all 17 sites which eased the administration burden
- The new medical plan is an enhancement compared to many of the plans that were in force at the majority of the sites prior to its establishment. It has a lower OOP (Out of Pocket) maximum and copayments and also includes a wellness program which will lead to better employee population health and lower medical cost over the foreseeable future.
- During the first 6 months of the plan year the new medical plan, which is a partially self funded arrangement accounted for savings of over \$180k compared to the agency budget and over \$222k compared to the comparable fully insured plan which was in force prior to this establishment of the new plan. This savings does not factor in the average increase the sites were experiencing. With this included, the savings would be in excess of 250K.
- Flexible Spending Account (FSA) administration at no cost provided by the Third Party Administrator (TPA) which administers the medical plan
- This modified flex plan approach is new for many sites that never had access to Section 125 benefits. The plan is now available to all CDS employees.
- The new dental plan includes innovative features like incentive basic coinsurance and annual maximum carry over rewards which promote good dental hygiene
- During the first 6 months of the plan year the new dental plan accounted for savings of approximately \$10k compared to the plan which was in force prior to its establishment.
- Introduced employer paid disability program (STD and LTD) which supplemented and partially replaced the “earned time” program. This lowered the cost and transferred the administrative burden from the HR Department to the insurance carrier. In addition, the reserve for unpaid time was reduced to fund the program at a savings.
- Sick time is now converted to Converted Disability Time up to 288 hours

- This earned time program allows employees ownership of their PTO dollars. This was designed to allow employees maximum flexibility and ensure that they not need to take sick time when not sick in order to “use up” their benefits.
- The PTO plan honors seniority via additional time off accrued based on length of service.
- Many CDS sites had not capped their sick time accrual and paid unused days upon termination which created a tremendous liability for CDS.
- We created, with the Advisory Board, a process where employees that had excess sick time at conversion, could request to use time for the illness of a family member or other situation that normally could not be covered with PTO.
- Employees were given a specific plan for taking additional vacation time and were given one year from July 1, 2006, to reduce their time balance. We capped the vacation account at 400 hours or 10 weeks for a 40/hour per week employee. This is very reasonable, as CDS also pays for STD and offer voluntary LTD.
- Employee benefit website was introduced which enables employees to view their current benefits, insurance carrier forms and contacts and do research online 24 hours a day. The website “mybenergy.com” is updated for employee convenience.
- We have moved forward with consolidating our retirement, which will not only save administrative costs, but will reduce the

	<p>asset charges to our employees; recordkeeping fees to the system and brings our plans into compliance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are working closely with an ERISA attorney to determine the most effective manner in which to offer one standard retirement savings plan. We have the enrollment kits ready and the plan design established.
<p>C. Establish a centralized system for statewide fiscal administration to be implemented by September 1, 2006. The State IEU shall establish internal controls and implement accounting policies and procedures in accordance with standards set forth by the State Controller.</p>	<p>The state IEU has created a comprehensive fiscal system that is responsive to the system needs crated by the 17 sites. Components of the system include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Implementation of a centralized payroll system ➤ Centralization of payments to MaineCare and private insurance. ➤ Centralization of accounts receivable ➤ Creation of an integrated and responsive accounting system ➤ Establishment a central contracts system.
<p>D. Develop a centralized data management system to be implemented beginning July 1, 2007;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Record details the day-to-day operations of sites. The management of all elements related to providing services for the children eligible for the CDS system. ➤ Insure that complete and accurate data is available. ➤ Efficient billing procedures. MaineCare and private insurance. <p>Benefits of the new data system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Centralized <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provides standard, statewide interfaces for data entry. ○ Provides a focal point for training issues. ○ Provides the ability to ensure compliance with internal controls and accounting policies and

	<p>procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provides more access ○ Provides easier access ○ Is more easily changed and maintained ○ Is more responsive to needs at multiple levels <p>➤ Interconnected</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Services provided to children are related to payments. ○ The child and payment systems are linked to the general accounting system. <p>➤ Secure</p> <p>Access controlled to assure that confidentiality is maintained.</p>
<p>E. Establish a standard, statewide template for site contracts with therapeutic service providers, including policies and procedures for the review of contracts, that shall be included in the annual entitlement plan described in section §7209, subsection 1, beginning in fiscal year 2007-08</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Template designed in 2005 by state AAG working on behalf of the CDS system utilized as interim 7/06-present • Contract extensions generated for all current and continuing providers 6/06 • Revised template for Baxter outreach and on site programs 2/07 • Provision of alternative contract language to meet specific site needs ongoing since 7/06

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised general template for ongoing use ready to be sent out to sites 4/07
<p>. Refine program accountability standards for compliance with federal mandates that shall be included in the annual entitlement plan, including the development of a performance review system to monitor and improve site performance through the utilization of efficiency ratings aligned with the accountability standards and through a compliance plan that requires the site to address the unmet needs of eligible children in accordance with specific targets and time frames;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot work with 4 sites to support the goals of the State Performance Plan resulted in models to be used for training statewide in January as well as data for the SPP indicators. • Triple P Project-regionalization of site administration was undertaken by the site directors of Penobscot, Peds, and Piscataquis sites. This has resulted in noticeable efficiencies in the administration and child find pods due to sharing of personnel for fiscal management, data management, training and childfind. The regionalization activities were designed to efficiently and effectively meet the needs of the children at each site in accordance with targets and timeframes. These sites have requested a decrease in FTE required.
<p>G.Design and implement a statewide plan to provide professional development and training to Child Development Services System personnel</p>	<p>CDS Professional Development Committee composed of state IEU and site directors developed a training plan for the year for system wide training</p> <p>Training completed/in process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAPE Training by AAG 11/06 • IFSP Training 1/07 • Outcomes Survey Training 1/07 • Follow-up to January Training in 3 of 4 regions-3/07 • Webinar training for Case e 11/07 for site directors

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Super Users training 11/20./07 • On site--ongoing refreshers as requested 1/07 to present • Webinar Training-secondary series 3/07-ongoing • Webinars for x-logs 3/07 ongoing • DOE IDEA 2004 for children ages 3-20--April/May 2007 • PART C by AAG 5/07 • Battelle Training May 21/22 2007 • Direct Step Training-(FAPE)TBA August 2007
<p>Employ professional and other personnel, including those necessary to ensure the implementation of the centralized fiscal and data management systems. All state intermediate educational unit employees are employees for purposes of the Maine Tort Claims Act.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HR solutions (consultants) 4/06-2/07 • HR/Payroll individual 5/06-8/06 • Temp Business Manager 8/06-10/06 • Temp HR Manager 8/06-11/06 • Permanent Business Manager/October 2006 • Permanent Human Resources Manager November 2006 • Payroll Clerk/December 2006 • Accounts Payable/March 2007 • Accounts Receivable/March 2007

The survey is for parents whose **child or children are under 3**. It is for parents of children who are getting early intervention services thru CDS. This survey is important to you and your child in Maine because your answers will help to improve services for children and families.

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

Phone number _____

Directions: For each question below, put an "X" in the box under **Never**, or **Rarely**, or **Often**, or **Always** based on your experiences. Skip any item that you feel does not apply to you or your child.

	Never	Rarely	Often	Always
<i>Over the past year, early intervention has helped me and/or my family:</i>				
1. participate in typical activities for children and families in my community				
2. know about services in the community				
3. improve my family's quality of life				
4. know where to go for support to meet my child's needs				
5. know where to go for support to meet my family's needs				
6. get the services my child and family need				
7. feel more confident in my skills as a parent				
8. keep up friendships for my child and family				
9. make changes in our routines that benefit my child with special needs				
10. be more effective in managing my child's behavior				
11. do activities that are good for my child even in times of stress				
<i>Over the past year, early intervention has helped me and/or my family:</i>				
12. feel I can get the services and supports my child and family need				
13. understand how the early intervention system works				
14. be able to evaluate how much progress my child is making				
15. feel that my <u>child</u> will be accepted and welcomed in the community				
16. feel that my <u>family</u> will be accepted and welcomed in the community				
17. communicate better with the people who work with my child and family				
18. understand the roles of the people who work with my child and family				
19. do things with and for my child that are good for their development				
20. understand my child's special needs				
21. feel that my efforts are helping my child				

22. What is your current involvement with CDS

- a. ___ My child has only been referred to CDS b. ___ My child is eligible for services
 c. ___ We are waiting for services to begin d. ___ We are receiving services

Please complete the other side

(over)

23. How old was your infant/toddler at the time you completed this survey?

- a. Birth to 1 year b. 1-2 years c. 2-3 years d. Over 3 years

24. How old was your child when he or she was first referred to CDS?

- a. Birth to 6 months b. 6 months to 12 months c. 12 months to 18 months
d. 18 months to 24 months e. 24 months to 30 months

25. Is your child a male or a female?

- a. Male b. Female

26. What is your child's race / ethnicity?

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

27. What is your relationship to the child?

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

28. Which statement best describes how well you understand your child's development?

- a. We are just starting to understand our child's development.
 b. We understand our child's development a little, but still have a lot to learn.
 c. We have a pretty good understanding of our child's development.
 d. We understand our child's development very well.

29. How well do you know your rights and what to do if you are not satisfied?

- a. We aren't sure about our rights or what to do if we aren't satisfied.
 b. We understand our rights but aren't sure about options if we are not satisfied.
 c. We think we know of our rights and what to do if we are not satisfied.
 d. We know our rights well and know exactly what to do if we are not satisfied.

30. How much has early intervention helped you know and understand your rights?

- a. It has not helped us know about our family's rights.
 b. It has done a few things to help us know about our rights.
 c. It has provided good help so that we know our family's rights.
 d. It has done an excellent job of helping us know our family's rights.

31. How would you describe your ability to help your child develop and learn?

- a. We need to know a lot more about how to help our child develop and learn.
 b. We know the basics of helping our child, but still have many questions.
 c. We feel pretty sure that we know how to help our child develop and learn.
 d. We are very sure that we know how to help our child develop and learn.

32. How much has early intervention helped your family be able to help your child develop and learn?

- a. It has not helped us help our child develop and learn.
 b. It has done a few things to help us help our child develop and learn.
 c. It has done a good job of helping us help our child develop and learn.
 d. It has done an excellent job of helping us help our child develop and learn.

Thank you. Please return the survey as soon as possible. Your answers will be combined with others who completed this survey and kept in the strictest confidence. The results will be posted on the Maine Department of Education website <http://www.state.me.us/education/homepage.htm>

**PART C
CHILD RECORD AUDIT FORM**

Names

<i>ITEMS</i>	<i>COMMENTS</i>			
<i>INITIAL REFERRAL AND EVALUATION</i>	<i>DOB</i>			
1. Initial referral form completed and includes the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child's name • Parent's name and contact information • Date of Birth • Areas of concern • Referral Source / Date • Physician's name • Insurance source • Initiation of screening process / date of initial screening 	Referral Date 1. 2. 3.			
2. Written notice to parent of initial referral <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State form (as of 9/1/07) • Filled out completely 				
3. Documentation of Parents provided with procedural safeguards				
4. Receipt of consent for initial evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State form (as of 10/1/07) 				
5. Input from the IFSP team to determine evaluation needs (if any)				
6. Appropriate referrals for evaluations documented				
7. Bailey / Battelle must be utilize to satisfy 303.322(c)(3)ii as part of initial evaluation (as of 3/30/07)				
8. Completion of evaluations and IFSP meeting held to review to determine eligibility within <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (B-2) 45 days from the regional site Board's receipt of referral 				

9. Development of IFSP with written consent for initial placement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New IFSP state form as of 9/1/07 				
9a. On the initial IFSP the signature of the parent, to indicate the informed and voluntary consent to the initial placement (services of the child)				
10. Written notice to parent for initial placement				
CURRENT IFSP Team Notices and Procedures				
10. Parental written notice of IFSP meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State form as of 10/1/07 				
For children B-2 attendance should include to determine eligibility: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> parent case manager physician (encouraged) evaluator service providers (if appropriate) Others as appropriate at site or parent discretion 				
11. IEU shall provide at least seven days prior notice of each IFSP meeting or have evidence of a waiver				
12. For children who will be transitioning from Part C to Part B ...the notice must include a statement of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose of the meeting is to consider transition Appropriate representatives of Part C and B and Local public school system has been invited Identify any other agency that will be invited to send a representative 				
B-2 transition into Part B: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> must be held at least 90 days prior to the child's 3rd birthday with explanation of Part B, and the parents makes informed decision of using IEP of IFSP 				
13. Documentation that a copy of the evaluation report was provided to the parent a reasonable time prior to the IFSP meeting at which the evaluation is discussed.				
14. Copy of IFSP to parents within 21 days of the meeting				
15. Written Notice to parent if SAU proposes or refuses to initiate or change identification, evaluation, educational program, placement, ...(Appendix 1 34 CRF 300.503)				
16. Prior written notice of implementation of an IEP of a transferring child				

EVALUATIONS

<p>18. Each SAU shall obtain informed parental consent prior:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for initial screening / evaluation • for each reevaluation and • before initiation of services <p>* State Form as of 10/1/07</p>				
<p>19. Input from the IEP Team to determine evaluation needs (if any)</p> <p>A. Written notice of reevaluation Determinations (State form)</p>				
<p>20. Use a variety of assessment tools and strategies; not use any single procedure as the sole criterion; use technically sound instruments</p>				
<p>20a. Child Outcome Summary form (as of 4/1/07) upon entry into services (within 30 days of identification) and upon exit from program if the child has been in services for 6 months or longer</p>				

IFSP TEAM PROCEDURES

<p>21. Required members present at the meetings –</p>				
<p>22. If parent not present, the SAU shall maintain a record of its efforts to arrange a mutually agreed upon time and place</p>				

TEAM CONSIDERATIONS IN DEVELOPING AN IFSP

<p>23. State IFSP form as of 9/1/07</p>				
<p>A. Family Routines and Priorities</p>				
<p>B. Present Abilities, strengths and needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of relevant Health Status 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using hand and Moving Body (Gross and Fine motor) 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding / Communicating (receptive and expressive language) 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Playing, Thinking, Exploring (Cognitive Skills) 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressing and Responding to Feelings & Interacting with others (Social and Emotional) 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eating, Dressing, and Toileting (Self –Help or Adaptive Skills) 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluator (s)’ name, credentials, role/ organization, signature and date 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team Summary chart of five domains 				
<p>C. Eligibility for Maine Part C Services Page with determination of eligibility indicated</p>				

INDIVIDUAL FAMILY SERVICE PLAN

24. Child / Family Outcomes including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome statement • Short term objectives • Strategies • Progress 				
24a. Natural Environment Justification and documentation				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EI services are being provided in the child’s natural environment 				
25. Transition Plan				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date of Child’s 3rd birthday 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date for transition conference (at least ninety days before the child’s third birthday) 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date Child exited from EI program 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anticipated Date of Transition 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priorities and goals for child’s transition 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transition Planning requirements and activities with person(s) responsible, date initiated and date to be completed. 				
26. Transition Conference				
27. Supports and Services needed to achieve Outcomes including:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific supports and services 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Method 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequency 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intensity 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualified Enrolled Provider 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding Source 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Start and End Dates 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other Services (other services needed by the child but not entitled under part C) 				
28. IFSP Signature Page with consent from parent for EI services				
29. Periodic Review of the IFSP documentation				
30. Financial Resources listed on IFSP				
31. Primary Health Care Provider Approval				

**PART B
CHILD RECORD AUDIT FORM**

Names

<i>ITEMS</i>	<i>COMMENTS</i>			
<i>INITIAL REFERRAL AND EVALUATION</i>	<i>DOB</i>			
1. Initial referral form completed and includes the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child's name • *Parent's name and contact information • *Date of Birth • *Areas of concern • *Referral Source / Date • *Physician's name • *Insurance source • *Initiation of screening process / date of initial screening 	Referral Date 1. 2. 3.			
2. Documentation of Parents provided with procedural safeguards				
3. Evidence of completion of Screening	Date of Screening 1. 2. 3.			
4. Written notice of initial referral <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Form as of 9/1/07 				
5. Input from the IEP team to determine evaluation needs (if any)				
6. <u>Receipt of consent for initial evaluation</u>				
7. Appropriate referrals for evaluations documented				
8. Completion of evaluations and IEP Team meeting held to review to determine eligibility within <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (3-5) 60 days from consent to evaluate received from parent and start referral for evaluation process. 				

9. Written Notice of determinations of the initial eligibility meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parental consent for placement signed if found eligible for services 				
10. Development of IEP within 30 days of the eligibility determination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State IEP as of 9/1/07 				
<i>CURRENT IEP</i>				
10. Parental written notice of IFSP/IEP meeting must include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parent’s right to be member of team • Procedural safeguards • Parent’s right to invite other individuals • Name of person who convened the meeting • Date/ Time/ location of the meeting • List of person’s titles and methods of participation (if alternate modes of attendance used, reason why) • NEW STATE FORM AS OF 10/1/07 				
For children 3-5 include in addition to above: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CDS representative who can commit funds and supervise the provision of services • The regular education teacher (if the child is or may be participating in a typically developing pre-school private or public school program.) 				
11. IEU shall provide at least seven days prior notice of each IEP meeting				
12. Kindergarten eligible children: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • must be held in the spring of the year eligible for public school in conjunction with the public school 				
13. Documentation that a copy of the evaluation report was provided to the parent a reasonable time prior to the IEP meeting at which the evaluation is discussed.				
14. Copy of IEP provided to parents within 21 days				
15. Written notice if IEU proposes or refuses to initiate or change identification, evaluation, <u>educational program</u>, placement... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New state Form as of 9/1/07 				
16. Written notice of implementation of an IEP of a transferring child				

EVALUATIONS

18. Each IEU shall obtain informed parental consent prior: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for initial screening / evaluation • for each reevaluation and 				
---	--	--	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • before initiation of services • NEW STATE FORM AS OF 10/1/07 				
<p>Informed written consent to release information must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • include list of records to be released and to whom • be signed by the parent 				
<p>19. Input from the IEP Team to determine evaluation needs (if any) A. State form of written notice of evaluation determinations</p>				
<p>20. Use a variety of assessment tools and strategies; not use any single procedure as the sole criterion; use technically sound instruments</p>				
IEP TEAM PROCEDURES				
<p>21. Required members present at the meetings –</p>				
<p>22. If parent not present, the IEP shall maintain a record of its efforts to arrange a mutually agreed upon time and place</p>				
<p>22a Agreement: In making changes to a child's IEP after the annual IEP meeting for a school year, the parent of a child with a disability and the SAU may agree not to convene an IEP meeting for the purposes of making such changes, and instead may develop a written document to amend or modify the child's current IEP. If changes are made to the child's IEP in accordance with (above), the SAU must ensure that the child's IEP Team is informed of these changes.</p> <p>Changes to the IEP may be made either by the entire IEP team at an IEP meeting or as provided by amending the IEP rather than redrafting the entire IEP. Upon request, a parent must be provided with a revised copy of the IEP with the amendments incorporated.</p>				
TEAM CONSIDERATIONS IN DEVELOPING AN IEP				
<p>For all children:</p> <p>NEW STATE FORM USED AS OF 9/1/07</p>				
<p>23. A. In developing or revising each child's IEP, the Team shall consider the strengths of the child...</p>				
<p>B. In developing each child's IEP, the Team shall consider the concerns of parents for enhancing the education...</p>				
<p>C. The Team shall consider, as appropriate, the results of the child's performance on any general assessment</p>				

D. The Team shall consider whether the child requires assistive technology devices and services				
E. The Team shall consider the results of the initial or most recent evaluation of the child				
F. The Team shall consider the academic, developmental, and functional needs of the child				
G. The Team shall consider the communication needs of the child, and in the case of a child who is deaf or hard of hearing, consider the child's language and communication needs..				
SPECIAL FACTORS (if appropriate)				
24. A. In the case of a child whose behavior impedes his/her learning, or that of others, the Team shall consider strategies, including positive behavioral interventions, strategies, and supports to address that behavior				
B. In the case of a child who is blind or visually Impaired, the Team shall provide for instruction in Braille...unless the team determines (Braille)...not appropriate				
C. In the case of a child with limited English proficiency, the Team shall consider the language needs of the child as these needs relate to the child's IEP				
INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM				
25. Statement of the child's present level of functioning and performance, including how the disability affects the child's participation in appropriate activities				
26. A Statement of measurable, annual goals (outcomes)				
27. Statement of <u>how</u> the child's progress toward the annual goals will be measured				
28. Measurable short-term instructional objectives or benchmarks				
29. Statement of how the child's parents will be regularly informed, at least as often as parents of children without disabilities are informed, of their child's progress toward their annual goals...				
30. Specific special education services				
31. Frequency of services to be provided				
32. Position of person responsible for service delivery				
33. Location of service delivery				

34. Frequency of supportive services to be provided				
35. Position of person responsible for delivery of supportive services				
36. Location of delivery of supportive services				
37. Date of initiation/duration of services (day, month, and year required)				
38. An <u>explanation</u> of the extent, if any, to which the child will not participate with non-disabled children in the regular class and in other non-academic activities				
39. Supplemental aids and services, program modifications or supports for personnel that will be provided to the child—to advance appropriately toward attaining the annual goals—to be involved and progress in the general curriculum...and to participate in other nonacademic activities...				
40. Special education transportation				
41. Accommodations necessary to measure the academic achievement and functional performance of the child on the outcomes assessment				
A. If the IEP Team determines that the child shall take an alternate outcomes assessment, a statement of why the child cannot participate in the regular assessment and the particular alternate assessment that will be given				
42. Statement of the child's eligibility for Extended School Year (ESY) services, as follows:				
A. review of progress reports, relevant assessments, parent report, observation documentation, etc.;				
B. consideration of the significance of the child's disability and documented progress toward IEP goals, and				
C. consideration of the documentation illustrating the impact of previous service interruptions, and the probability that the child is unable to recoup skills previously mastered in a reasonable amount of time (see attached chart)				

CHILD RECORD AUDIT FORM

Meets Compliance Standards = 95% compliance or above

PART C FILES

<i>ITEMS</i>	<i>COMMENTS</i>			
<i>INITIAL REFERRAL AND EVALUATION</i>				
<p>1. Initial referral form completed and includes the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child's name • *Parent's name and contact information • *Date of Birth • *Areas of concern • *Referral Source / Date • *Physician's name • *Insurance source • *Initiation of screening process / date of initial screening 				Meets Compliance Standards
<p>2. Prior written notice of initial referral (Must contain all components of prior written notice)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • actions proposed • explanation of the action • alternative actions considered and or rejected • other relevant factors • description of evaluation procedures, assessment, record, or report used in decision making • sources for assistance of Parental rights and safeguards (3-5) 				0% compliance Needs Corrective Action
<p>3. Documentation of Parents provided with procedural safeguards</p>				Meets Compliance Standards
<p>4. Evidence of completion of Screening</p>				Meets Compliance Standards
<p>5. Input from the IFSP / IEP team to determine evaluation needs (if any)</p>	<p>Lack of clear documentation in files</p>			25% compliance Needs Corrective Action
<p>6. <u>Receipt of consent for initial evaluation</u></p>	<p>Forms were found in files but did not specify specific evaluations ordered by the team. The site was using a general consent form for all possible evaluations.</p> <p>New State Form must be adopted</p>			Needs Corrective Action

7. Appropriate referrals for evaluations documented		Meets Compliance Standards
8. Completion of evaluations and ECT meeting held to review to determine eligibility within <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (3-5) 60 days from permission to complete screening and start referral for evaluation process. (B-2) 45 days from the regional site Board's receipt of referral 		0% Compliance Needs Corrective Action
9. Development of IFSP / IEP and written consent for initial placement(including physician approval) (must provide all components of prior written notice)		Meets Compliance Standards
9a. On the initial IFSP/IEP, the signature of the parent, to indicate the informed and voluntary consent to the initial placement (services of the child)		Meets Compliance Standards
<i>CURRENT IFSP / IEP</i>		
10. Parental written notice of IFSP/IEP meeting must include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parent's right to be member of team Procedural safeguards Parent's right to invite other individuals Name of person who convened the meeting Date/ Time/ location of the meeting List of person's titles and methods of participation (if alternate modes of attendance used, reason why) 	The notices were found to be on file but did not include all components required in regulations (180 or 101). New State Form needs to be adopted	Needs Corrective Action
For children B-2 attendance should include to determine eligibility: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> parent case manager physician (encouraged) evaluator service providers (if appropriate) Others as appropriate at site or parent discretion 		Meets Compliance Standards
11. IEU shall provide at least seven days prior notice of each IEP meeting		Meets Compliance Standards
12. For children who will be transitioning from Part C to Part B and to kindergarten...the notice must include a statement of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose of the meeting is to consider transition Appropriate representatives of Part C and B and Local public school system has been invited Identify any other agency that will be invited to send a representative 	All aspects of Transition needs to be addressed in Corrective action plan 0% compliance in all transition areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> notice with purpose and attendees timelines for Part C to part B Kindergarten transition process 	Needs Corrective Action

B-2 transition into Part B: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> must be held at least 90 days prior to the child's 3rd birthday with explanation of Part B, and the parents makes informed decision of using IEP of IFSP 		Needs Corrective Action
Kindergarten eligible children: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> must be held in the spring of the year eligible for public school in conjunction with the public school 		Needs Corrective Action
13. Documentation that a copy of the evaluation report was provided to the parent a reasonable time prior to the IFSP / IEP meeting at which the evaluation is discussed.		Meets Compliance Standards
14. Copy of IEP Team minutes to parents within 21 days		Meets Compliance Standards
15. Copy of IEP provided to parents within 21 days		Meets Compliance Standards
16. Prior written notice if IEU proposes or refuses to initiate or change identification, evaluation, <u>educational program</u>, placement...		Meets Compliance Standards
17. Prior written notice of implementation of an IEP of a transferring child		N/A

EVALUATIONS

18. Each IEU shall obtain informed parental consent prior: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> for initial screening / evaluation for each reevaluation and before initiation of services 	Form issue (noted above in initial evaluation section) New State Form needs to be adopted	50% compliance Needs Corrective Action
Informed written consent must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> be in native language include a description of actions being proposed include list of records to be released and to whom be voluntary (remind families they can accept some services and refuse others (B-2) 		Meets Compliance Standards
For Re-evaluations: If members of IEP Team determine that no additional data are needed, the IEU shall notify the parents		N/A
19. Input from the IEP Team to determine evaluation needs (if any) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Prior written notice of reevaluation determinations 		Meets Compliance Standards

20. Use a variety of assessment tools and strategies; not use any single procedure as the sole criterion; use technically sound instruments		Meets Compliance Standards
20 a. For Part C (B-2): Bailey / Battelle must be utilize to satisfy 303.322(c)(3)ii as part of initial evaluation (3/30/07)		Meets Compliance Standards
<i>ITEMS</i>	<i>COMMENTS</i>	
IFSP / IEP TEAM PROCEDURES		
21. Required members present at the meetings –		Meets Compliance Standards
22. If parent not present, (Part B) the IEU shall maintain a record of its efforts to arrange a mutually agreed upon time and place		N/A
TEAM CONSIDERATIONS IN DEVELOPING AN IFSP/IEP		
<p style="color: red;">In verification review of twelve of the same files reviewed by the YCCDS staff, this auditor found nine out of the 12 children’s files without current IFSPs on file. Please see isolated deficiency letter sent to Site Director on November 5, 2007 with specific corrective action required.</p> <p style="color: blue;">Of the remaining files verified and reviewed for part C children, the remaining areas of the IFSP below met compliance based on the YCCDS IFSP except the transition steps needed to determine Part B eligibility.</p> <p style="color: red;">The required state IFSP Form needs to be adopted.</p>		
23. A. In developing or revising each child’s IFSP / IEP, the Team shall consider the strengths of the child...		
B. In developing each child’s IEP, the Team shall consider the concerns of parents for enhancing the education...		
C. The Team shall consider, as appropriate, the results of the child’s performance on any general assessment		
D. The Team shall consider whether the child requires assistive technology devices and services		
E. The Team shall consider the results of the initial or most recent evaluation of the child		
F. The Team shall consider the academic, developmental, and functional needs of the child		
G. The Team shall consider the communication needs of the child, and in the case of a child who is deaf or hard of hearing, consider the child’s language and communication needs..		

INDIVIDUALIZED FAMILY SERVICE PLAN (B-2)

<p>Each IFSP must include:</p> <p>A. Statement of present levels of development [cognitive, physical (including vision, hearing, and health status) communication, social emotional, adaptive] based on objective criteria and how disability affects participation in appropriate activities;</p>		
<p>B. Statement of family’s resources, priorities, and concerns (voluntary – document if declined);</p>		
<p>C. Statement of major outcomes to be achieved for the child and family (include criteria, procedures, and timelines to determine progress);</p>		
<p>D. Statement of the early intervention services necessary to meet the unique needs of the child / family:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • -Frequency, intensity, method of delivery • Natural environment and justification of extent not in • Location [actual place(s)] • Payment arrangements 		
<p>Medical and other services not required under Part C, and funding sources of steps to secure services from public or private sources.</p>		
<p>Projected dates for initiation of services(s) and anticipated duration.</p>		
<p>Steps to be taken to support transition to Part B (if eligible or school) or other services that may be available.</p>		<p>Needs Corrective Action</p>

CHILD RECORD AUDIT FORM
Meets Compliance Standards = 95% compliance or above

PART B FILES

<i>ITEMS</i>	<i>COMMENTS</i>	<i>Compliance Percentage</i>
<i>INITIAL REFERRAL AND EVALUATION</i>		
1. Initial referral form completed and includes the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child’s name • *Parent’s name and contact information • *Date of Birth • *Areas of concern • *Referral Source / Date • *Physician’s name • *Insurance source • *Initiation of screening process / date of initial screening 		87% compliance Needs Corrective Action
2. Prior written notice of initial referral (Must contain all components of prior written notice) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • actions proposed • explanation of the action • alternative actions considered and or rejected • other relevant factors • description of evaluation procedures, assessment, record, or report used in decision making • sources for assistance of Parental rights and safeguards (3-5) 		0% Compliance Needs Corrective Action
3. Documentation of Parents provided with procedural safeguards		Meets Compliance Standards
4. Evidence of completion of Screening		Meets Compliance Standards
5. Input from the IFSP / IEP team to determine evaluation needs (if any)		Meets Compliance Standards
6. <u>Receipt of consent for initial evaluation</u>	Forms were found in files but did not specify specific evaluations ordered by the team. The site was using a general consent form for all possible evaluations. New State Form must be adopted	77% compliance Needs Corrective Action
7. Appropriate referrals for evaluations documented		85% compliance Needs Corrective Action

<p>8. Completion of evaluations and ECT meeting held to review to determine eligibility within</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (3-5) 60 days from permission to complete screening and start referral for evaluation process. • (B-2) 45 days from the regional site Board's receipt of referral 		<p>38% compliance Needs Corrective Action</p>
<p>9. Development of IFSP / IEP and written consent for initial placement(including physician approval) (must provide all components of prior written notice)</p>		<p>85% compliance Needs Corrective Action</p>
<p>9a. On the initial IFSP/IEP, the signature of the parent, to indicate the informed and voluntary consent to the initial placement (services of the child)</p>		<p>Meets Compliance Standards</p>
<p><i>CURRENT IFSP / IEP</i></p>		
<p>10. Parental written notice of IFSP/IEP meeting must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parent's right to be member of team • Procedural safeguards • Parent's right to invite other individuals • Name of person who convened the meeting • Date/ Time/ location of the meeting • List of person's titles and methods of participation (if alternate modes of attendance used, reason why) • 	<p>Notices were not found in files New forms were not being used after 9/1/07</p>	<p>43% Compliance Needs Corrective Action</p>
<p>For children 3-5 include in addition to above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CDS representative who can commit funds and supervise the provision of services • The regular education teacher (if the child is or may be participating in a typically developing pre-school private or public school program.) 		<p>58% compliance Needs Corrective Action</p>
<p>11. IEU shall provide at least seven days prior notice of each IEP meeting</p>		<p>58% compliance Needs Corrective Action</p>
<p>12. For children who will be transitioning from Part C to Part B and to kindergarten...the notice must include a statement of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of the meeting is to consider transition • Appropriate representatives of Part C and B and Local public school system has been invited • Identify any other agency that will be invited to send a representative 	<p>All aspects of Transition needs to be addressed in Corrective action plan 0% compliance in all transition areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • notice with purpose and attendees • timelines for Part C to part B • Kindergarten transition process 	<p>Needs Corrective Action</p>
<p>B-2 transition into Part B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • must be held at least 90 days prior to the child's 3rd birthday with explanation of Part B, and the parents makes informed decision of using IEP of IFSP 		<p>Needs Corrective Action</p>

Kindergarten eligible children: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • must be held in the spring of the year eligible for public school in conjunction with the public school 		Needs Corrective Action
13. Documentation that a copy of the evaluation report was provided to the parent a reasonable time prior to the IFSP / IEP meeting at which the evaluation is discussed.		Meets Compliance Standards
14. Copy of IEP Team minutes to parents within 21 days	Lack of documentation in the files reviewed	47% compliance Needs Corrective Action
15. Copy of IEP provided to parents within 21 days	Lack of documentation in the files reviewed	47% compliance Needs Corrective Action
16. Prior written notice if IEU proposes or refuses to initiate or change identification, evaluation, <u>educational program, placement...</u>		50% compliance Needs Corrective Action
17. Prior written notice of implementation of an IEP of a transferring child		N/A

EVALUATIONS

18. Each IEU shall obtain informed parental consent prior: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for initial screening / evaluation • for each reevaluation and • before initiation of services 	Forms were found in files but did not specify specific evaluations ordered by the team. The site was using a general consent form for all possible evaluations. New State Form must be adopted	50% Compliance Needs Corrective Action
Informed written consent must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be in native language • include a description of actions being proposed • include list of records to be released and to whom • be voluntary (remind families they can accept some services and refuse others (B-2)) 		Meets Compliance Standards
19. Input from the IEP Team to determine evaluation needs (if any) A. Prior written notice of reevaluation determinations		Meets Compliance Standards
20. Use a variety of assessment tools and strategies; not use any single procedure as the sole criterion; use technically sound instruments		Meets Compliance Standards
20 a. For Part C (B-2): Bailey / Battelle must be utilize to satisfy 303.322(c)(3)ii as part of initial evaluation (3/30/07)		N/A

<i>ITEMS</i>	<i>COMMENTS</i>	
21. Required members present at the meetings –		Meets Compliance Standards
22. If parent not present, the IEU shall maintain a record of its efforts to arrange a mutually agreed upon time and place		Meets Compliance Standards
INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PLAN (IEP)		
The following areas found 0% compliant with Form issues noted in the comment area, should be corrected with the adoption of the new State Required IEP form. These areas were required under Chapter 180 but had not been addressed in the YCCDS IEP.		
23. A. In developing or revising each child’s IFSP / IEP, the Team shall consider the strengths of the child...		Meets Compliance Standards
B. In developing each child’s IEP, the Team shall consider the concerns of parents for enhancing the education...	Form indicated that is areas was only to be addressed on IFSP	0% compliance Needs Corrective Action
C. The Team shall consider, as appropriate, the results of the child’s performance on any general assessment		Meets Compliance Standards
D. The Team shall consider whether the child requires assistive technology devices and services	Form issue	0% compliance Needs Corrective Action
E. The Team shall consider the results of the initial or most recent evaluation of the child		Meets Compliance Standards
F. The Team shall consider the academic, developmental, and functional needs of the child		Meets Compliance Standards
G. The Team shall consider the communication needs of the child, and in the case of a child who is deaf or hard of hearing, consider the child’s language and communication needs..		0% compliance Needs Corrective Action
24. A. In the case of a child whose behavior impedes his/her learning, or that of others, the Team shall consider strategies, including positive behavioral interventions, strategies, and supports to address that behavior	Form issue	0% compliance Needs Corrective Action

<p>B. In the case of a child who is blind or visually Impaired, the Team shall provide for instruction in Braille...unless the team determines (Braille)...not appropriate</p>	<p>Form issue</p>	<p>0% compliance Needs Corrective Action</p>
<p>C. In the case of a child with limited English proficiency, the Team shall consider the language needs of the child as these needs relate to the child's IEP</p>	<p>Form issue</p>	<p>0% compliance Needs Corrective Action</p>
<p>25. Statement of the child's present level of functioning and performance, including how the disability affects the child's participation in appropriate activities</p>		<p>Meets Compliance Standards</p>
<p>26. A Statement of measurable, annual goals (outcomes)</p>		<p>Meets Compliance Standards</p>
<p>27. Statement of <u>how</u> the child's progress toward the annual goals will be measured</p>		<p>Meets Compliance Standards</p>
<p>28. Measurable short-term instructional objectives or benchmarks</p>		<p>Meets Compliance Standards</p>
<p>29. Statement of how the child's parents will be regularly informed, at least as often as parents of children without disabilities are informed, of their child's progress toward their annual goals...</p>		<p>0% compliance Needs Corrective Action</p>
<p>30. Specific special education services</p>		<p>Meets Compliance Standards</p>
<p>31. Frequency of services to be provided</p>		<p>Meets Compliance Standards</p>
<p>32. Position of person responsible for service delivery</p>		<p>Meets Compliance Standards</p>
<p>33. Location of service delivery</p>	<p>Multiple locations were listed under a single service line</p>	<p>Needs Corrective Action</p>
<p>34. Frequency of supportive services to be provided</p>	<p>Form issue</p>	<p>0% compliance Needs Corrective Action</p>
<p>35. Position of person responsible for delivery of supportive services</p>	<p>Form issue</p>	<p>0% compliance Needs Corrective Action</p>

36. Location of delivery of supportive services	Form issue	0% compliance Needs Corrective Action
37. Date of initiation/duration of services (day, month, and year required)	Plans were written to exceed one year by one day. Plans need to reflect the following example dates: 12/10/07 – 12/09/08	0% compliance Needs Corrective Action
38. An <u>explanation</u> of the extent, if any, to which the child will not participate with non-disabled children in the regular class and in other non-academic activities	The area on the form was filled out but did not meet standards of quality justification statements of the Least Restrictive Environment. They did not give the determination of where the child receives the services based upon their unique needs versus availability of services or recommendation of services providers. This should be a focus of training.	Needs Corrective Action
39. Supplemental aids and services, program modifications or supports for personnel that will be provided to the child—to advance appropriately toward attaining the annual goals—to be involved and progress in the general curriculum...and to participate in other nonacademic activities...	Form issue	0% compliance Needs Corrective Action
40. Special education transportation		Meets Compliance Standards
41. Accommodations necessary to measure the academic achievement and functional performance of the child on the outcomes assessment	Form issue	0% compliance Needs Corrective Action
A. If the IEP Team determines that the child shall take an alternate outcomes assessment, a statement of why the child cannot participate in the regular assessment and the particular alternate assessment that will be given		N/A
42. Statement of the child's eligibility for Extended School Year (ESY) services, as follows: A. review of progress reports, relevant assessments, parent report, observation documentation, etc.;	The area of Extended School Year Services was not a focus during this review. This area will be reviewed in 2008	
B. consideration of the significance of the child's disability and documented progress toward IEP goals, and		
C. consideration of the documentation illustrating the impact of previous service interruptions, and the probability that the child is unable to		

recoup skills previously mastered in a reasonable amount of time (see attached chart)		
--	--	--

5/29/07 elt

December 6, 2007

Elizabeth Mahoney
CDS York County Board Chair
57 Heath Road
Kennebunk, Maine 04043

Dear Ms. Mahoney:

Please accept this letter as a summative letter of findings based upon the on-going monitoring process that was initiated in April 2006 by the Department of Education. It will include the findings of the most recent on-site visit that took place in October of 2007, references and correlation to the original letter of findings of February 2007 and determinations of corrective action plan requirements to address areas of non-compliance.

First, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the site director, the staff for the effort that was extended to accommodate the on-site monitoring visit that took place over a three day period from October 9th, 10th and 11th, 2007. The involvement of staff in this process is beneficial to all. Please express my gratitude to all of the staff in taking part in the internal audit and answering my paperwork questions while I was at the York County Child Development Office (YCCDS) for the on-site visit.

1. The Process:

As determined in my letter of September 21, 2007 to the site director, Sue Motta, an on-site monitoring visit was deemed necessary after the receipt and review of the YCCDS site self-review plan and summary of the internal audit of files. The reason for the determination was based upon the site self-review plan, see attachment #1, and the child record audit summary forms for both part C and part B of IDEA, attachment #2, submitted by the Site Director being deemed by the Department as insufficient and incomplete. Upon request for the raw data collected to support the summary forms, the information was forwarded to my office. After a comparison of the raw data collected by the case managers to the summary forms completed by the site director, there was a significant discrepancy between the two sets of information. This raised a significant amount of concern in the validity of the site self-review plan and the goals outlined by the director to improve compliance performance.

Over the three day period indicated above, a comprehensive verification review of the same files reviewed by the YCCDS staff during their internal audit was conducted. This letter and attached summary child record audit forms, attachment #3 and #4, will outline the data gathered during this review.

2. Record Audit:

During the on site visit, the following areas of both Part C and Part B were examined:

- Referral, screening procedures and timelines;
- Parent notices and consents;
- Procedures involving evaluations and IFSP and IEP Team Meetings;
- Individual Family Service Plans (IFSP) and Individual Education Plans (IEP);
- Communication with Parents

These areas were reviewed in a comprehensive audit of the children's records.

Attached are the compiled results of the record audit. Any section not receiving a 95% rate of compliance is identified as needing corrective action. Identified corrective action needs on the record audit are followed by comments as to why the item did not meet the regulation standard.

In reviewing the files, the following areas in Part C met compliance:

- Initial referral forms completed and on-file in each child's record
- Documentation of providing Parents with Procedural Rights and Safeguards
- Evidence of completing initial screening
- Documentation of appropriate referrals for evaluations
- Development of the initial IFSP/IEP at the Early Childhood meeting and attaining parental voluntary consent for initial placement and provision of services.
- Prior Written Notice upon eligibility determination at the meeting
- Team meeting notices sent out to parents at least seven days prior to the meeting.
- Documentation that copies of the evaluation reports were provided to the parent within reasonable time prior to the IFSP/ IEP meeting at which the evaluation was discussed.
- Documentation of copies of the minutes and IFSP / IEP provided to the parent within 21 days of the meeting
- Prior Written Notice sent to parents when a change in the child's program was proposed
- Documentation of input from the team to determine evaluation needs.

- The use of a variety of assessment tools and strategies during the evaluation and eligibility process
- Utilization of the Bailey / Battelle assessment tool as part of the initial referral process

The following areas did not meet compliance:

- Prior written notice of the initial referral for evaluation was not documented
- Evidence of input for the IFSP / IEP team to determine the evaluation needs of the child suspected of having a disability
- Receipt of Consent for Initial Evaluation
- Completion of evaluations and ECT meetings held to review to determine eligibility within 45 days from the regional site board's receipt of referral.
- The ECT meeting notices and membership by required staff
- Documentation of appropriate consent forms for evaluations
 - Form being utilized did not meet compliance standards due to the lack of specificity in what areas of evaluations were being consented to by the parent.
- Transition planning
 - For children entering Part B at least 90 days before the child's third birthday
 - Documenting steps to be taken to support transition to Part B or Kindergarten on the IFSP.
 - Transition meetings held in the spring for Kindergarten eligible children
- All aspects of the IFSP could not be found in compliance based upon the files reviewed during the on-site visit. (See attachment #3 and attached letter of significant non-compliance of Nov. 5, 2007, attachment #5 for further information)
- Adoption of required State IFSP form as of September 1, 2007.

In reviewing the files, the following areas in Part B met compliance:

- Documentation of providing Parents with Procedural Rights and Safeguards
- Evidence of completing initial screening
- Evidence of input for the IEP team to determine the evaluation needs of the child suspected of having a disability
- Attaining parental voluntary consent for initial placement and provision of services.
- Input from the team to determine evaluation needs is any with prior written notice provided to the parent.
- The use of a variety of assessment tools and strategies in the evaluation process.
- Documentation of copies of evaluations being provided to parents within a reasonable amount of time prior to the IEP team meeting.
- Documentation of required members present at the IEP team meetings.

- The consideration of the child's strengths, the results of the child's performance on assessments; the initial or most recent evaluation of the child; the academic, developmental and functional needs of the child.
- On the IEP the following areas met compliance:
 - Statement of the child's present level of functioning and performance, including how the disability affects the child's participation in appropriate activities
 - Statements of annual goals
 - Statement of how the child's progress toward the annual goals will be measured
 - Measurable short-term objectives
 - Specific special education services, frequency of services , and position of person responsible
 - Documentation of the need for special education transportation

The following areas did not meet compliance:

- Initial referral form documentation
- Prior Written notice of Initial referral for evaluations
- Receipt of Consent for Initial Evaluation and any additional evaluations determined by the IEP team.
- Documentation of Appropriate Referrals for evaluations
- Meeting the 60 day time line from the receipt of consent to evaluate to a meeting being held to determine eligibility for special education services.
- Development of the initial IFSP/IEP at the Early Childhood meeting
- The IFSP team meeting notices and membership by required staff sent out to parents at least seven days prior to the meeting
- Prior Written Notice sent to the parents documenting the determinations of eligibility meeting.
- Conducting transition meetings in conjunction with the public school in the spring of the year the child is eligible.
- Documentation of copies of the minutes and IEP provided to the parent within 21 days of the meeting
- Prior Written Notice sent to parents when a change in the child's program was proposed
- IEP did not include consideration of special factors (behavior, blind / visual impairment needs, and limited English proficiency), statement of how parents will be regularly informed of their child's progress toward goals,
- Team considerations in developing the IFSP/ IEP did not include a statement of assistive technology needs.

- The consideration of communication needs of the child
- Specific location of services listed on the IEP
- Date of initiation/ duration of services exceeded a year by one day
- An explanation of the extent, if any, to which the child will not participate with non-disabled children in the regular class and in other non-academic activities
- Documentation of supplementary aids and services and program modifications

3. Summary of Findings

After a review of the original letter of findings of February of 2007, the site self review plan and the findings of the on-site audit of records, the areas of non-compliance listed above appear to have been uncorrected and remain out of compliance.

Based upon the review of all documentation received by the Child Development Services at the Department of Education from monitoring of the YCCDS, the lack of general supervision and leadership in the implementation of the requirements of the previous Chapter 180, Chapter 101 and new required State Special Education forms, has greatly impeded the site's compliance with state and federal regulations. The original areas of non-compliance from 2006-2007 remain out of compliance and should have been addressed upon receipt of the original letter of findings.

Of greater concern is the validity of the information submitted to the Department as part of the site self-review plan. The effort and substance of the Plan was and is considered to sub-standard and unacceptable. The raw data received from the site did not correlate to the summary forms submitted by the site director and subsequently the findings of the on-site audit did support the findings of both sources of data. The data submitted by the site was viewed as inaccurate and a false representation of the sites actual compliance with state and federal regulations. The approach in which the site director took in completing the site self review plan should be and needs to be addressed by the YCCDS board of directors. Compliance with the Department's monitoring process is mandatory and sanctions may be implemented against the site if it does not comply with the process.

In addition, the site was found to be significantly out of compliance in the area of having current IFSP/ IEPs in place in the files when they were reviewed. A letter was sent on Nov. 5th, 2007 indicating the need for immediate corrective action to occur and evidence to be submitted no later than December 20th. The Department received a response on December 3rd to the areas of non-compliance and it is currently under review at the time of this report.

In consultation with the fiscal department of the CDS Department of Education division, it is also found that there are considerable non-compliance data entry issues occurring that impact the timeliness of payments to providers. There is considerable evidence regarding delay of payments to providers due to the lack of required, timely, entry of IFSP / IEP data into the data

management system, CASE-E. It is recommended an increased level of supervision of the data entry process of children's plans into CASE-E occur by the site director to ensure compliance in a timely manner. This should be addressed with the site's corrective action plan.

Based upon the findings of this summative review of the monitoring activities of the YCCDS site since 2006, the following corrective action plan development determinations are required to be reviewed by the YCCDS board of directors with a submission of a corrective action plan submitted to the Department of Education as outlined.

4. Corrective Action Plan Development:

- 1.) **The Site will have one year from the date of this report to correct all areas of non-compliance that did not meet 95% compliance and all areas that the Need Corrective Action in Section 2 of this report. A corrective action plan must be submitted to the Department of Education, Child Development Services Department no later than January 25, 2008. If such corrective action plan is not received by the required date, sanctions will be implemented in accordance with Chapter 101, Maine State Regulations.**
- 2.) **It is required that the York County CDS site implement the new required state special education forms. A mandatory training for the YCCDS staff on the new forms needs to be scheduled before January 25th. The site director is required to contact me at 624-6660 to set up a date for the training.**
- 3.) **The site needs to establish a meeting with the appropriate state level data management and fiscal staff to establish protocol and training for the staff on required data entry needs to ensure timely payment of YCCDS invoices no later than January 30, 2008.**
- 4.) **A future on-site review of Extended School year Services will occur during the summer of 2008.**

The Department of Education conducted a survey of parents of children with disabilities within your region. The results of this survey are attached. As CDS sites continue to improve services for all children, parent input is critical. These results can serve as additional information to be used in the planning and evaluation of services and programs for children and are used during the annual State Performance Plan to the federal government.

In accordance with the Freedom of Access Act, all letters related to the Special Education Program Monitoring are public record and shall be made available to parents and other members of the public upon request.

If there are questions regarding this report, you can contact me at the Department of Education at 624-6660.

Sincerely,

Erica Thompson, Distinguished Educator
Child Development Services Program Monitoring and Technical Assistance

Copies sent to:

Susan A Gendron, Commissioner
David Noble Stockford, Policy and Team Leader
Debra Hannigan, State Director Child Development Services
Sue Motta, York County Child Development Services Director

Attachments:

- #1 YCCDS Site Self- Review Plan
- #2 YCCDS Child record audit forms submitted by site director
- #3 Part C Child Record Audit Form Summary
- #4 Part B Child Record Audit Form Summary
- #5 Letter of non-compliance of Nov. 5, 2007

CDS York County Part Survey Results

TABLE 7

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

PAGE 1 OF 1

OMB NO.: 1820-0678

FORM EXPIRES: XX/XX/XXXX

STATE:

ME - MAINE

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

SECTION B: MEDIATION REQUESTS	
(2) Mediation requests total	1
(2.1) Mediations	1
(a) Mediations related to due process	0
(i) Mediation agreements	0
(b) Mediations not related to due process	1
(i) Mediation agreements	1
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	0

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