State of Maine

Department of Education

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Update for FFY 2010 (July 2010 – June 2011)

February 1, 2012

Revised April 17, 2012

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS 2

REVISION HISTORY 3

OVERVIEW OF THE STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN DEVELOPMENT 4

FAPE IN THE LRE 6

- INDICATOR 1 7
- INDICATOR 2 11
- INDICATOR 3 14
- INDICATOR 4 26
- INDICATOR 5 31
- INDICATOR 6 36
- INDICATOR 7 38
- INDICATOR 8 48

DISPROPORTIONALITY 53

- INDICATOR 9 54
- INDICATOR 10 58

EFFECTIVE GENERAL SUPERVISION PART B / CHILD FIND 62

- INDICATOR 11 63

EFFECTIVE GENERAL SUPERVISION PART B / EFFECTIVE TRANSITION 66

- INDICATOR 12 67
- INDICATOR 13 70
- INDICATOR 14 73

EFFECTIVE GENERAL SUPERVISION PART B / GENERAL SUPERVISION 78

- INDICATOR 15 79
- INDICATOR 16 82
- INDICATOR 17 84
- INDICATOR 18 86
- INDICATOR 19 89
- INDICATOR 20 92

TABLE 7 97

- REPORT OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION UNDER PART B 97

APPENDIX 98

- PART B 619 PARENT SURVEY - CHILDREN BETWEEN AGES 3 AND 5 99
- PART B SCHOOL AGE PARENT SURVEY - CHILDREN 5 OR OLDER 101
- PROPORTION ANALYSIS 103
- ANALYSIS OF POST HIGH SCHOOL OUTCOMES SURVEY 107

Revision History

Original: Mailed paper copy to OSEP – 12-1-05

Submission*:* Electronic copy to OSERS.bapr@ed.gov – 12-02-05

Update: revised indicators 5, 16, 17, 19, and Attachment 1; e-mailed to Cynthia Bryant at OSEP – 1-20-06

Update of all indicators' format to present activities, resources and timelines in tabular format – January 29, 2007

Updated 4/23/07 to include required changes to indicators 4, 8, 18 and 20

Revision May 7, 2007 to Indicator 18 to provide ending (FFY 2010) target that is above the baseline

Revision February 2008 to include changes presented in the February 1, 2008 FFY2006 Annual Performance Report (APR)

Revision April 7, 2009 to respond to changes presented in the April 7, 2009 FFY2007 Annual Performance Report (APR) update

Revision Feb 10, 2010 to include changes presented in the February 1, 2010 FFY2008 Annual Performance Report (APR)

Revision Feb 1, 2011 to include target data and improvement activities for FFY2011 and FFY2012. Indicators 4B, 13 and 14 updated to include new baseline data and targets for the remaining years of the SPP.

Revision Feb 1, 2012 updating indicator, measurement and supporting language for FFY2010 submission.

Provided clarification April 17, 2012 of indicators 4 (page 26) and 14 (pages 74, 75 and 76) in response to status table Revision Issues.

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development

Maine submitted its State Performance Plan (SPP) on December 2, 2005, followed by revisions periodically as changes in the plan were required by legislation, regulation, or reporting guidance. Additionally, updates have been made to evolve the document with changes in measurements and new data. All versions of the SPP are posted by date of update on the Maine Department of Education website at http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/index.html for public review. A brief list of the change history is included following the Table of Contents on page 3.

This update includes modification to the language in the indicators and measurement descriptions to conform to the Measurement Table provided with OSEP memo 12-4 dated November 28, 2011. Summary of changes in this revision:

Indicator	Change from previous version of the SPP in April 7, 2009
TOC	Pages numbers updated.
Overview	Revised statistical language to proportion analysis to replace former reference to Analysis of Means.
1	Updated indicator and measurement from the measurement table. Added Cohort 2009.
2	Updated indicator and measurement from the measurement table.
3	Updated indicator and measurement from the measurement table. Updated the AYP and tested grades descriptions to current.
4	Combined and updated language for both parts of the indicator (4A and 4B). Updated the definition of significant discrepancy and target language for indicator 4B.
5	Updated indicator and measurement from the measurement table. Described the inclusion of LRE data in the Local Entitlement application.
6	Updated indicator and measurement from the measurement table. Modified target statements and language to indicate data are not reported.
7	Updated indicator and measurement from the measurement table.
8	Updated survey administration process to reflect current practice.
9	May want to revise statistical language to proportion analysis.
10	May want to revise statistical language to proportion analysis.
11	Updated indicator and measurement from the measurement table. Updated data collection method description to account for the difference between 3 to 5 and school aged measurements
12	Included the need to describe how to account for the children not include in the other numbers to the measurement description.
13	No changes
14	Revised the measurement process to new methodology with improve data sources. Set new targets.
15	Revised the description of the process for selecting district monitoring schedule.
16	No changes
17	Corrected error in improvement activity.
18	No changes
19	No changes
20	No changes
Appendix	Revised to describe proportion analysis.
Throughout	Made changes to update content highlighted yellow. Indicator header changed to span 2005-2012

Maine Advisory Council for the Education of Children with Disabilities (MACECD) is the stakeholder organization supporting the development of the SPP indicators. Development of indicator content and revision of indicators has been guided by the stakeholder group throughout the life of the SPP. 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 has benefited greatly from the advice and guidance of our stakeholder organization.

This update to the SPP includes changes to indicators that provide consistency and accuracy of measurement across all indicators. As data were assembled and reviewed for the Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) across the state as a part of the measurement process, it became clear that many of our districts have very small populations represented in certain measurement categories. In order to ensure FERPA protections in the public presentation of data, a minimum of 10 students must be present in the data. In cases where a particular subset contains fewer than 10 students, those data are suppressed. Many of the SPP measurements require comparison of percentages between populations. Sizes in many of Maine's LEAs are sufficiently small that statistically significant definitions were required to account normally occurring variation in small population data. Proportion analysis calculations were applied to each percentage measurement to establish upper and lower detection bounds that were sensitive to the small populations in our districts. Data found outside of the bounds exhibit significant difference from the state average while accounting for their small population values, and will be assigned a level of determination consistent with the magnitude of the deviation from the state average. Additional discussion of the proportion analysis calculation is included in the Appendix.

Maine Department of Education has provided substantial technical assistance to its LEAs during the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school years concerning the SPP and its Annual Performance Report. Regional meetings were held in May of 2005, December of 2006, and in April of 2007 to provide understanding of the requirements and intent of the SPP and to offer guidance to LEAs in preparing for and reacting to the range of likely measurement outcomes. The sessions have helped the LEAs to become comfortable with the accountability system, planning improvements and defining professional development needs. Further, the sessions have provide opportunities for the LEAs to express concerns and ask questions that have shaped the support provide by the Maine Department of Education on the content that is posted on its website. The December 2005 submission of the SPP started a process that will cause LEAs to catch up. Data presented at that time establish a baseline performance using 2003-2004 school year performance. The data presented in the APR for the 2005-2006 school year, had been collected at the time of the SPP submission, so LEAs have had only limited opportunity to affect improvements based on the data. As the data were presented publicly in early 2007, the process for system-wide improvement began.

Monitoring Priority:

Free and Appropriate Education

in the

Least Restrictive Environment

Or

FAPE in the LRE

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: 1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.

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

Measurement:

This is the same data and calculation as is used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

The definition of high school graduation rate is to compare the number of students that entered ninth grade with the number that receive a regular high school diploma in accordance with Maine 05-071 CMR Ch. 127 by the end of the fourth year after entering ninth grade for the first time. For students with an IEP, or LEP students with a Personal Learning Plan that extends the time to earn a high school diploma, up to six years can be allowed and will be also counted separately. Extending the timeframe for completion allows this federal accountability criterion to align with Maine's established accountability system.

Maine determines the graduation rate as follows:

$$\left(\frac{\text{On-time graduates by year } x}{[(\text{first time } 9^{th} \text{ graders in year } x\text{-}4) + (\text{Transfers-In}) - (\text{Transfers-Out})]} \right) \times 100$$

This rate includes "Other Completers" as well as regular graduates in the denominator

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Definition of Diploma:

Maine's State law, Title 20-A §4722 High School Diploma Standards, defines diploma as: "3. Satisfactory Completion, A diploma may be awarded to secondary school students who have satisfactorily completed all diploma requirements in accordance with the academic standards of the school administrative unit and this chapter. All secondary school students must work toward achievement of the content standards of the system of *Learning Results*. Exceptional students, as defined in section 7001, subsection 2, who successfully meet the content standards of the system of learning results in addition to any other diploma requirements applicable to all secondary school students, as specified by the goals and objective of their individualized education plans may be awarded a high school diploma.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

For purposes of generating baseline data for this indicator, several years of Part B 618 data were used to compute a graduation rate for special education students. Special Education Graduation Rates

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

Discussion of Baseline Data:

For the FFY2006 reporting year (2006-2007 school year), the data were no longer required to be reported in comparable form, so reporting of graduation rate was converted to students with IEPs only. The graduation rates were calculated based on the count of all students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma divided by the total of students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma plus dropouts occurring during that same school year. This computation allowed Maine to compare graduation rates for students with IEPs with graduation rates for all students. The comparable graduation rate calculation was used to develop the original graduation rate historical data used in the State Performance Plan (SPP) for students with IEPs. Since the Measurable and Rigorous Targets established in the SPP were based on this calculation method, and the number of student with IEPs is a small proportion of students with IEPs exiting, the targets remain as originally projected. In 2009-2010, the state began using the Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate described in the measurement above. This calculation and the data definitions are the same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	At least **76%** of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma
2006 (2006-2007)	At least **78%** of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma
2007 (2007-2008)	At least **80%** of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma
2008 (2008-2009)	At least **82%** of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009 (2009-2010)	At least **84%** of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma
2010 (2010-2011)	At least **86%** of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma
2011 (2011-2012)	At least **86%** of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma
2012 (2012-2013)	At least **86%** of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
Conduct regional workshops to inform superintendents and special education directors of the dropout targets set in this SPP.	X	X							
Request that each school and LEA complete a self-assessment of its district and school dropout prevention programs.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST
Review the performance of all districts and schools to determine whether dropout prevention activities are working.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST
Provide districts with longitudinal baseline data for future program improvement activities.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST
Build and implement an LEA determination scheme that includes graduation rates as a part of the measurement.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST
Require LEAs to develop dropout prevention activities for raising the scores of those areas that the self-assessment showed as needing improvement.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST
Provide training to districts on how to develop an effective dropout prevention program.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST
Conform to the National Governor's Association cohort calculation methodology for graduation rates					X	X	X	X	GSST
Target those districts whose rates remain above the target and provide technical assistance.		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
Each LEA with a determination of Needs Assistance or lower will be required to complete an in-depth self-assessment of this indicator				X	X	X	X	X	GSST

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

Measurement: The number students with IEPs dropping out of high school divided by the number of students with IEPs enrolled in high school, the same data and calculation as is used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Definition of Dropout in Maine Statute:

Title 20-A: EDUCATION
Part 3: ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
Chapter 211: ATTENDANCE
Subchapter 3: DROPOUTS

§5102. Definitions

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

For purposes of generating baseline data for this indicator, several years of Part B 618 data were used to compute a dropout rate for special education students. See the chart below for the number and percentage data computed for the past several years.

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

Discussion of Baseline Data:

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	A dropout rate of **4.6%** or lower for students with IEPs
2006 (2006-2007)	A dropout rate of **4.0%** or lower for students with IEPs
2007 (2007-2008)	A dropout rate of **3.5%** or lower for students with IEPs
2008 (2008-2009)	A dropout rate of **3.0%** or lower for students with IEPs
2009 (2009-2010)	A dropout rate of **2.5%** or lower for students with IEPs
2010 (2010-2011)	A dropout rate of **2.0%** or lower for students with IEPs
2011 (2011-2012)	A dropout rate of **2.0%** or lower for students with IEPs
2012 (2012-2013)	A dropout rate of **2.0%** or lower for students with IEPs

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
Conduct regional workshops to inform superintendents and special education directors of the dropout targets set in this SPP.	X	X							
Request that each school and LEA complete a self-assessment of its district and school dropout prevention programs.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST
Review the performance of all districts and schools to determine whether dropout prevention activities are working.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST
Provide districts with longitudinal baseline data for future program improvement activities.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST
Build and implement an LEA determination scheme that includes graduation rates as a part of the measurement.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST
Require LEAs to develop dropout prevention activities for raising the scores of those areas that the self-assessment showed as needing improvement.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST
Provide training to districts on how to develop an effective dropout prevention program.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST
Conform to the National Governor's Association cohort calculation methodology for graduation rates					X	X	X	X	GSST
Target those districts whose rates remain above the target and provide technical assistance.		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST
Build a Departmental collaboration with NCLB resources to coordinate dropout prevention activities, planning and corrective actions in the state's neediest LEAs.			X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST
Each LEA with a determination of Needs Assistance or lower will be required to complete an in-depth self-assessment of this indicator				X	X	X	X	X	GSST

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup.

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Measurement:

A. A. AYP percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size)] times 100.

B. B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in the assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

C. Proficiency rate percent = ([(# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math)].

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Adequate Yearly Progress is determined for all schools in the state under the No Child Left Behind requirements defined under ESEA. Results for all school for all years reported can be found on the state's website http://www.maine.gov/education/pressreleases/ayp/index.html. Unfortunately, those data do not present a district level score for the special education subgroup. To accomplish the measurement for the indicator 3, part A, the individual school data are aggregated in distinct pools to assess the special education subgroup performance district-wide. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is calculated annually for all schools (not districts) with student populations larger than 41. Determination of AYP of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup is accomplished by verifying that ALL eligible schools in the district meet AYP for BOTH reading and math performance for students with disabilities. In order to meet the AYP target for the subgroup, the LEA must have met ESEA benchmarks in BOTH reading and math in elementary, middle and high schools in the district. Targets and target data are therefore to be reported overall (reading and math), not separately for reading and math. The SPP targets have been adjusted to meet these requirements.

The original participation and performance data and targets formulated in 2005 were based on testing the only include students in grades 4, 8 and 11. Beginning in the 2008-2009 school year, grades 3, 5, 6 and 7 were added to the testing each year. When the Maine State Legislature adopted the initial Learning Results in 1996, it established learning standards for all Maine students educated at public expense. The legislation also required a new system for assessing student progress resulting in the MeCAS program. The Maine Educational Assessment (MEA) fulfilled this requirement for many years. In 2009, Maine

joined New Hampshire, Vermont and Rhode Island as a member of the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) to assess reading, writing, and mathematics in grades 3-8. The Maine High School Assessment (MHSA), for students in grade 11, provides individual student scores reported for critical reading, mathematics, writing, and science. The results from those two test sets in the subject areas Reading Language Arts, and Mathematics, are used as the basis for the participation and performance measurement presented annually after 2008 for indicators 4B and 4C.

The baseline data for 2004 presented below do not include all grades currently tested and reported in the Annual Performance Report. Targets presented in the Measureable and Rigorous Targets table below show the measurement target configured for the additional grade test in the years 2008 and later.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

3A: Adequate Yearly Progress
Table 1 provides baseline data for Adequate Yearly Progress. Since AYP in Maine is measured by combining two years of assessments, these figures represent data from 2002-03 through 2003-04 which is then reported for 2004-05.

Table 3.1: Adequate Yearly Progress data 2004-05

	Number	Percent
Number of LEAs	223	100.0%
Number of LEAs meeting AYP objectives for the disability subgroup in Reading	215	96.4%
Number of LEAs meeting AYP objectives for the disability subgroup in Math	220	98.7%

3B: Participation

Maine's target for participation is 95%. As Table 2 indicates, 98% - 99% students with IEPs participate in either the MEA or PAAP.

Table 3.2: Participation Rates of Students with IEPs in the Maine Educational Assessment 2004-05

	4th Grade		8th Grade		11th Grade	
Reading	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Participated - no accommodations	373	16%	448	17%	398	20%
Participated - accommodations	1802	76%	1944	74%	1433	72%
Participated - alternate assessment, alternate standards	192	8%	209	8%	138	7%
Did not participate	16	1%	34	1%	29	1%
Total	2383	100%	2635	100%	1998	100%
	4th Grade		8th Grade		11th Grade	
Math	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Participated - no accommodations	367	15%	438	17%	393	20%
Participated - accommodations	1848	78%	1956	74%	1421	71%
Participated - alternate assessment, alternate standards	155	7%	208	8%	140	7%
Did not participate	13	1%	33	1%	44	2%
Total	2383	100%	2635	100%	1998	100%

In 2004-05, 2383 4th grade students with IEPs were assessed in reading and math.
Of those:
16% participated with no accommodations in reading, 15% in math
76% participated with accommodations in reading, 78% in math
0% took an alternate assessment against grade standards in reading, 0% in math.
8% took an alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards in reading, 7% in math.
1% of students with IEPs did not participate in reading, 1% in math.
Overall 4th grade participation rate for 2004-05 = 99% in reading, 99% in math.

2635 8th grade students with IEPs were assessed in reading and math in 2004-05.
Of those:
17% participated with no accommodations in reading, 17% in math
74% participated with accommodations in reading 74% in math
8% took an alternate assessment against grade standards in reading, 8% in math
0% took an alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards in reading, 0% in math
1% did not participate in reading, 1% in math
Overall 8th grade participation rate for 2004-05 = 99% in reading, 99% in math

1998 11th grade students with IEPs were assessed in reading and math in 2004-05.
Of those:
20% participated with no accommodations in reading, 20% in math
72% participated with accommodations in reading 71% in math
7% took an alternate assessment against grade standards in reading, 7% in math
0% took an alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards in reading, 0% for math
1% did not participate in reading, 2% in math
Overall 11th grade participation rate for 2004-05 = 99% in reading, 98% in math

Figures 4 and 5 provide a longitudinal view of participation rates of students with IEPs.
Figure 3.1: Reading Assessment Participation Rates for Students with IEPs



	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
4th	84%	98%	99%	99%
8th	87%	96%	99%	99%
11th	92%	96%	99%	98%

Figure 3.2: Math Assessment Participation Rates for Students with IEPs



	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
4th	84%	86%	99%	99%
8th	84%	84%	99%	99%
11th	80%	87%	99%	98%

3C: Proficiency

Table 3.3: Proficiency Rates of Students with IEPs on the Maine Educational Assessment 2003-04

	4th Grade			8th Grade			11th Grade		
Reading	# Tested	# Proficient	% Proficient	# Tested	# Proficient	% Proficient	# Tested	# Proficient	% Proficient
Proficient - no accommodations	373	139	37%	448	75	17%	398	60	15%
Proficient - accommodations	1802	315	17%	1944	136	7%	1433	65	5%
Proficient - PAAP, alternate standards	192	19	10%	209	28	13%	138	15	11%
Total	2367	473	20%	2601	239	9%	1969	140	7%
	4th Grade			8th Grade			11th Grade		
Math	# Tested	# Proficient	% Proficient	# Tested	# Proficient	% Proficient	# Tested	# Proficient	% Proficient
Proficient - no accommodations	367	92	25%	438	52	12%	393	17	4%
Proficient - accommodations	1848	326	18%	1956	95	5%	1421	20	1%
Proficient - PAAP, alternate standards	155	12	8%	208	18	9%	140	11	8%
Total	2370	430	18%	2602	165	6%	1954	48	2%

Fourth Grade
Of the 2367 4th grade students with IEPs who were tested in reading
37% were proficient without accommodations
17% were proficient with accommodations
10% were proficient on the alternate assessment against alternate standards
0% were proficient on the alternate assessment against grade level standards

Of the 2370 4th grade students with IEPs who were tested in math
25% were proficient without accommodations
18% were proficient with accommodations
8% were proficient on the alternate assessment against alternate standards
0% were proficient on the alternate assessment against grade level standards

Eighth Grade
Of the 2601 8th grade students with IEPs who were tested in reading
17% were proficient without accommodations
7% were proficient with accommodations
13% were proficient on the alternate assessment against alternate standards
0% were proficient on the alternate assessment against grade level standards

Of the 2602 8th grade students with IEPs who were tested in math
12% were proficient without accommodations

5% were proficient with accommodations
9% were proficient on the alternate assessment against alternate standards
0% were proficient on the alternate assessment against grade level standards

Eleventh Grade
Of the 1969 11th grade students with IEPs who were tested in reading
15% were proficient without accommodations
5% were proficient with accommodations
11% were proficient on the alternate assessment against alternate standards
0% were proficient on the alternate assessment against grade level standards

Of the 1954 11th grade students with IEPs who were tested in math
4% were proficient without accommodations
1% were proficient with accommodations
8% were proficient on the alternate assessment against alternate standards
0% were proficient on the alternate assessment against grade level standards

Figures 6 and 7 show longitudinal data on the proficiency of students with IEPs against State NCLB established targets. The same targets will be used for students with IEPs since this group constitutes a sub-group within Title 1a.

Figure 3.3: Proficiency of Students with IEPs on Maine Educational Assessment in Reading 2001-02 through 2004-05



	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
4th target	34%	34%	34%	41%
4th	12%	10%	17%	24%
8th target	35%	35%	35%	42%
8th	7%	7%	4%	13%
11th target	44%	44%	44%	50%
11th	9%	5%	12%	11%

Figure 3.4: Proficiency of Students with IEPs on Maine Educational Assessment in Math 2001-02 - 2004-05



	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
4th target	12%	12%	12%	21%
4th	8%	11%	13%	21%
8th target	13%	13%	13%	22%
8th		2%	3%	10%
11th target	11%	11%	11%	20%
11th	3%	1%	6%	6%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The astute reader will have noted that the percentages shown in Table 3 differ slightly from the percentages shown in Figures 6 and 7. For example, the percentage of fourth graders with IEPs who are proficient in reading is 19% according to Table 3, compared to the 24% proficiency rate shown in Figure 6. The reason for the differences is that the data contained in Table 3 came directly from student level files that have been calculated without consideration of subgroup sizes, confidence intervals and other calculations that go into determining the overall proficiency rate. Therefore the proficiency rate shown in Table 3 tends to underestimate the proficiency level of students with IEPs.

The longitudinal proficiency data indicate that efforts to improve reading skills are beginning to have an impact, particularly on 4th graders, but also on 8th graders. Eleventh graders do not appear to be making progress in reading. With regard to math proficiency, the data indicate the 4th graders have reached the target. Eight graders are improving and even the eleventh grade is showing modest gain.

Measureable and Rigorous Targets:

2005 **(2005-2006)**	At least **97%** of LEAs will meet the State's AYP objective in reading for the disability subgroup. At least **98.8%** of LEAs will meet the State's AYP objective in math for the disability subgroup. In Reading, at least **98%** of 4th and 8th graders, and at least **90%** of 11th graders will participate.

	In Math, at least **98%** of 4th and 8th graders, and at least **90%** of 11th graders will participate. Proficiency rates in Reading will be at least **41%** for 4th graders, **42%** for 8th graders, and **50%** for 11th graders. Proficiency rates in Math will be at least **21%** for 4th graders, **22%** for 8th graders, and **22%** for 11th graders.
2006 **(2006-2007)**	At least **97.5%** of LEAs will meet the State's AYP objective in reading for the disability subgroup. At least **99%** of LEAs will meet the State's AYP objective in math for the disability subgroup. In Reading, at least **98%** of 4th and 8th graders, and at least **92%** of 11th graders will participate. In Math, at least **98%** of 4th and 8th graders, and at least **92%** of 11th graders will participate. Proficiency rates in Reading will be at least **41%** for 4th graders, **42%** for 8th graders, and **50%** for 11th graders. Proficiency rates in Math will be at least **21%** for 4th graders, **22%** for 8th graders, and **22%** for 11th graders.
2007 **(2007-2008)**	At least **97.5%** of LEAs will meet the State's AYP objective in reading for the disability subgroup. At least **99%** of LEAs will meet the State's AYP objective in math for the disability subgroup. In Reading, at least **98%** of **3rd,** 4th, **5th, 6th, 7th** and 8th graders, and at least **93%** of 11th graders will participate. In Math, at least **98%** of 4th and 8th graders, and at least **93%** of 11th graders will participate. Proficiency rates in Reading will be at least **49%** for 4th graders, **50%** for **3rd, 5th, 6th, 7th, and** 8th graders, and **57%** for 11th graders. Proficiency rates in Math will be at least **32%** for 4th graders, **40% for 3rd, 5th, 6th, and 7th graders, 33%** for 8th graders, and **33%** for 11th graders.

	A. % of LEAs Meeting AYP for disability subgroup.		*B. % Participation for students with IEPs*		*C. % Proficiency for students with IEPs*		
2008 (2008-2009)	*Reading*	*Math*	*Reading*	*Math*	*Reading*	*Math*	*Grade*
	98%		*98%*	*98%*	*58%*	*50%*	*3 – 8*
					64%	*43%*	*High school*
2009 *(2009-2010)*	*A. % of LEAs Meeting AYP for disability subgroup.*		*B.% Participation for students with IEPs*		*C. % Proficiency for students with IEPs*		
	Reading	*Math*	*Reading*	*Math*	*Reading*	*Math*	*Reading*
	98%		*98%*	*98%*	*66%*	*60%*	*3 – 8*

					71%	*54%*	*High school*
2010 (2010-2011)	*A. % of LEAs Meeting AYP for disability subgroup.*		*B. % Participation for students with IEPs*		*C. % Proficiency for students with IEPs*		
	Reading	*Math*	*Reading*	*Math*	*Reading*	*Math*	*Reading*
	98%		*98%*	*98%*	*75%*	*70%*	*3 – 8*
					78%	*66%*	*High school*
2011 (2011-2012)	*A. % of LEAs Meeting AYP for disability subgroup.*		*B.% Participation for students with IEPs*		*C. % Proficiency for students with IEPs*		
	Reading	*Math*	*Reading*	*Math*	*Reading*	*Math*	*Reading*
	98%		*98%*	*98%*	*75%*	*70%*	*3 – 8*
					78%	*66%*	*High school*
2012 (2012-2013)	*A. % of LEAs Meeting AYP for disability subgroup.*		*B. % Participation for students with IEPs*		*C. % Proficiency for students with IEPs*		
	Reading	*Math*	*Reading*	*Math*	*Reading*	*Math*	*Reading*
	98%		*98%*	*98%*	*75%*	*70%*	*3 – 8*
					78%	*66%*	*High school*

Note: Participation and performance targets changed April 7, 2009 to add grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 and to align the target values with the NCLB performance targets for FFY 2007 through FFY2010.

Measurement requirements changes for FFY2008 required realignment of AYP target to reflect a single percentage for measurement A. for % of LEAs Meeting AYP for disability subgroup in both Math and Reading. Additionally, data were disaggregated for measurement C. for % Proficiency for students with IEPs to display proficiency of students in math and reading in two subgroups: grades 3 – 8; and high school. Targets for FFY2008, FFY2009, and FFY2010 were modified to provide targets for the subgroups indicated. The changes are highlighted gray in the table above.

Improvement Activities	***Timelines***								***Resources***
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	***06***	***07***	***08***	***09***	***10***	***11***	***12***	
Collaborate with NCLB to improve Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)			*X*	*X*					*MDOE*
Collaborate with NCLB to develop a growth model for improvement in MEA and SAT results that provides identification of the most needy classrooms/students across all grades assessed.			*X*	*X*	*X*				*MDOE*

Improvement Activities	***Timelines***								***Resources***
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	***06***	***07***	***08***	***09***	***10***	***11***	***12***	
Collaborate with NCLB to implement classroom improvement activities based on performance and participation data specific to the classroom and teacher.			*X*	*X*	*X*	*X*	*X*	*X*	*MDOE*
State Personnel Development Grant's (SPDG) Goal 2 funds the improvement strategies of the State Performance Plan. At this time, the SPDG funded RMC Team from Arlington and Portsmouth to develop and implement a process that includes the NCLB AYP team and IDEA Program Monitoring Team to improve performance in fourteen of the 148 eligible LEAs. This process includes:			*X*	*X*	*X*	*X*			
1. District requests assistance on the IDEA SPP Indicators that received a rating of level 3 and/or 4 (needs intervention or needs substantial intervention)			*X*	*X*	*X*	*X*			
2. The project explores coordination with NCLB School Improvement Team and consults with the IDEA Monitoring team			*X*	*X*	*X*	*X*			
3. The project obtains additional information/data from the district and MDOE web sites			*X*	*X*	*X*	*X*			
4. The project staff conduct an initial phone interview to obtain more information and identify next steps			*X*	*X*	*X*	*X*			
5. The project conducts a general needs assessment based on additional data provided by the district			*X*	*X*	*X*	*X*			
6. The project arranges for a site visit (observations, interviews, and document reviews) which could include a special education review process (RMC has developed in conjunction with staff from OSU)			*X*	*X*	*X*	*X*			
7. Based on the site visit's findings and recommendations, the project assists the district in systematic improvement planning that addresses the needs of students with disabilities and completes an improvement plan			*X*	*X*	*X*	*X*			
8. MDOE reviews the improvement plan and provides feedback			*X*	*X*	*X*	*X*			

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
9. The project determines the technical assistance to be provided to the district in alignment with the improvement plan, develops a technical assistance plan, and provides the assistance to the district focused on the IDEA SPP Indicators			X	X	X	X			
10. The district and project staff are involved with the evaluation of the effectiveness and outcomes of the assistance and improvement plan			X	X	X	X			
Implement the integrated IDEA/NCLB accountability system				X					
The LEA review conducted in April-May 2008 will be scaled up to meet the needs of LEAs (5) at the Need Intervention determination level					X	X			

The annual goal for the state and for statewide subgroups will rise slowly at first to allow time for school improvements to be reflected in the grade-span scores for student proficiency. Following this “start-up” period, the trajectory is a line up to 100% proficiency by 2014. Any statewide subgroup that is below the state performance target and that improves by less than the amount specified will be labeled as not making adequate progress. MDOE will undertake an improvement plan to address performance of students in the statewide subgroup. Figures 11 and 12 below show the projected targets through for student achievement on the Maine Educational Assessment from 2001-02 through 2013-14 for both reading and math.

NCLB consultants are working closely with schools not making AYP that are in continuous improvement status. They meet with these LEAs and schools and provide technical assistance on core curriculum development, alternate methods of teaching and help the LEA develop a comprehensive work plan to enable the school/LEA to meet AYP. MDOE Special Services staff is working cooperatively with these consultants providing data analysis and program assistance to ensure that children with IEPs meet participation and proficiency targets.

Figure 3.5: Projected Percent of Students with IEPs Meeting or Exceeding the Standards on the Maine Educational Assessment in Reading: 4th, 8th, and 11th grades.



	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
4th	34%	34%	34%	41%	41%	41%	49%	58%	66%	75%	83%	92%	100%
8th	35%	35%	35%	42%	42%	42%	50%	58%	67%	75%	83%	92%	100%
11th	44%	44%	44%	50%	50%	50%	57%	64%	71%	78%	86%	93%	100%

Figure 3.6: Projected Percent of Students with IEPs Meeting or Exceeding the Standards on the Maine Educational Assessment in Math: 4th, 8th, and 11th grades.



	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
4th	12%	12%	12%	21%	21%	21%	32%	43%	55%	66%	77%	89%	100%
8th	13%	13%	13%	22%	22%	22%	33%	44%	55%	66%	78%	89%	100%
11th	13%	13%	13%	22%	22%	22%	33%	44%	55%	66%	78%	89%	100%

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

State's definition of significant discrepancy for indicator 4A:

The following decision rules were used to determine if there was a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions/expulsions of children with disabilities:

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

B. Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

State's definition of significant discrepancy for Indicator 4B:

The following decision rules were used to determine if there was a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions/expulsions of children with disabilities by race of ethnicity:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Office of Substance Abuse (OSA) is no longer responsible for tracking suspension/expulsion data it formerly collected along with Incidents of Prohibitive Behavior (IPB) data. Maine collects behavioral incidents in its state student information system, Maine Education Data Management System (MEDMS), and uses those data for tracking suspensions and expulsions, incidences of prohibited behavior, and other reporting. The system provide reports of aggregate incident data for EDFacts reporting, resulting in the data previously submitted in 618 data report Table 5, REPORT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY REMOVAL. These data are submitted via EDEN/EDFacts both aggregated at the SEA level, and disaggregated by district. The district data are used to perform the calculations necessary to produce the identification of significant discrepancy.

Definition of Significant Discrepancy

The following decision rules were used to determine if there was a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions/expulsions of children with disabilities:

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

Additionally for indicator 4b, the rules above will apply for the data disaggregated by race or ethnicity. A district must have more than 10 student with disabilities total of all ethnicities, one student with disabilities of any ethnicity must have been suspended/expelled for more than 10 days, and then the district will be deemed to have a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for students with disabilities of each ethnicity is more than 3 standard deviations above the state's suspension/expulsion rate for all students with disabilities of that same ethnicity.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005) for Measurement A

Table 4 provides baseline data for Measurement A. Using the discrepancy definition outlined above, 3 of 153 districts suspend or expel 3.5 times more students with IEPs than the state average.

Table 4: districts Exhibiting a Significant Discrepancy in the Rate of Suspension/Expulsion of Students with IEPs

	# districts
# with Significant Discrepancy	3
# without Significant Discrepancy	152
Total	153
% with Significant Discrepancy	1.96%

In addition to identification of districts exhibiting significant discrepancy, an absolute measure of suspension and expulsion rate is being used to ensure reduction of rates over time. In 2005-2006, 497 of 26, 246 students with IEPs were suspended for more than 10 days or expelled from school (1.9%). As the number of districts exhibiting significant discrepancy reduces to 0 (in FFY 2007), the suspension and expulsion percentage rate will begin to be used as the basis for measurement and improvement.

Baseline Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) for Indicator 4B

To determine whether a significant discrepancy existed between different ethnic groups, the data from 2009-2010 were assessed using standard deviation measures described in the definition of significant discrepancy. Analysis identified no districts with significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	
	A. Percent of districts with significant discrepancy of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days.	*B. Percent of districts with significant discrepancy of suspensions and expulsions by ethnicity.*
2005 (2005-2006)	New calculation methodology produces a baseline of 3 of districts with a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. The rate of suspension expulsion is 1.9% statewide	Develop methods for identifying significant discrepancies that minimize the probability of saying there is a significant discrepancy when there is not. Work with the Office of Information Technology (OIT) to have in place an alternative method for capturing Incidence of Prohibitive Behaviors that lead to suspension/expulsion, based on an incident-by-incident method rather than an end-of-year report.
2006 (2006-2007)	Reduce the suspension expulsion rate for students with IEPs from 1.9% to 1.75%. Reduce the number of districts with significant discrepancies to 1	Reduce the suspension expulsion rate for students with IEPs from 1.9% to 1.75%. Reduce the number of districts with significant discrepancies to 1
2007 (2007-2008)	Reduce the suspension expulsion rate for students with IEPs from 1.75% to 1.70%. Reduce the number of districts with significant discrepancies to 0	Reduce the suspension expulsion rate for students with IEPs from 1.75% to 1.70%. Reduce the number of districts with significant discrepancies to 0
2008 (2008-2009)	Reduce the suspension expulsion rate for students with IEPs from 1.70% to 1.65%. Maintain the number of districts with significant discrepancies at 0	Reduce the suspension expulsion rate for students with IEPs from 1.70% to 1.65%. Maintain the number of districts with significant discrepancies at 0
2009 (2009-2010)	Reduce the suspension expulsion rate for students with IEPs from 1.65% to 1.60%. Maintain the number of districts with significant discrepancies at 0	Reduce the suspension expulsion rate for students with IEPs from 1.65% to 1.60%. Maintain the number of districts with significant discrepancies at 0
2010 (2010-2011)	Reduce the suspension expulsion rate for students with IEPs from 1.60% to 1.55%. Maintain the number of districts with significant discrepancies at 0	0% of districts have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs resulting from policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.
2011 (2011-2012)	Reduce the suspension expulsion rate for students with IEPs from 1.60% to 1.55%. Maintain the number of districts with significant discrepancies at 0	0% of districts have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs resulting from policies, procedures or practices that contribute to

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	
		the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.
2012 (2012-2013)	Reduce the suspension expulsion rate for students with IEPs from 1.60% to 1.55%. Maintain the number of districts with significant discrepancies at 0	0% of districts have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs resulting from policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Note: Target values for indicator 4B for the reporting years FFY 2010 through FFY 2010 were modified in the FFY2009 SPP revision to align with the new measurement language.

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
Provide technical assistance to districts requesting assistance on the Indicator 4 that received a rating of level 3 and/or 4 (needs intervention or needs substantial intervention)			X	X					RMC, MDOE
Perform data analysis on student discipline and on the district's practice that generate that address, support and promote reductions in disciplinary actions.				X	X	X	X	X	MDOE
Assist the district in systematic improvement planning that addresses the needs of students with disabilities and complete an improvement plan				X	X				MDOE
Integrate data validation rules into the data input screens in Infinite campus to provide interactive feedback during data entry				X					Data Management Team
Each district with a determination of Needs Assistance or lower will be required to complete an in-depth self-assessment of this indicator				X	X	X	X	X	GSST
Review of data will be conduct each year for all districts. Those districts exhibiting disproportionate representation will receive a focus monitoring review to assess their policies practices and procedures for identification.						X	X	X	GSST

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
Technical assistance and professional development will be provided to districts who have not met the target.						X	X	X	GSST

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;

B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and

C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Statewide data have been reported in aggregate form in the Annual Performance Report for several years. The State Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process incorporates an LEA by LEA report structure that calculates A, B, and C for each LEA. The report is used as a portion of the Focused Monitoring process to highlight schools with significant deviations in their data as potential candidates for on-site monitoring visits. A five-year, statewide trend exists showing overall percentage of students in classroom settings.

The State adds these data for each district in the Local Entitlement application for the district. If the district's data are significantly (more than 3 standard deviations) lower than the state average in regular classroom placement, a focused project must be developed in the application to address the discrepancy. The district is encouraged during the development of the project to consider the use of local entitlement funds as necessary to address the discrepancy and improve their data concerning the use of the least restrictive environment.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

See next page

Table 5.1: Educational Placement of Students 6-21 with IFSPs or IEPs 2000-2004

Maine Department of Education - EF-S-05 Reports					
Year	Number of students ages 6-21	Number of students placed outside the classroom <21% of the day	Number of students placed outside the classroom 21%-60% of the day	Number of students placed outside the classroom >60%of the day	Students placed in a separate facility
2000	31655	16456	9901	4190	1108
2001	32350	17099	9947	4047	1257
2002	32657	17269	10158	4011	1219
2003	33137	17813	10229	3891	1204
2004	32767	18145	9569	3829	1224
2005	32174	18376	9069	3593	1136
2006	31419	17771	8852	3641	1155

Source: http://portalx.bisoex.state.me.us/pls/doe/eddev.efs05_user_reports.find_county?v_source=cedp

Figure 5.1: Educational Placement of Students 6-21 with IFSPs or IEPs by Percent 2000-2006



The students depicted by the data labeled “<21%” of the time are those students frequently referred to as “regular classroom” placements; it is anticipated that the new language of this indicator will present an affirmative expression of their placement as “in regular classroom for greater than 80% of the school day”

or something similar. The students depicted by the data labeled “21%-60%” are those students formerly identified as “resource room” students, which this indicator does not measure. The students depicted by the data labeled “>60%” are those students formerly identified as “self-contained” classroom students whose needs are far greater than can be served in a regular classroom setting. “Separate Facility” placements include Public Separate Day School Placement, Private Separate Day School Placement, Public Residential Placement, Private Residential Placement, Homebound or Hospital Placement, Early Childhood Setting, Early Childhood Special Education Setting, Home, Part-Time Early Childhood/Part-Time Early Childhood Special Education, Residential Facility, and Separate School (within or outside the State).

Discussion of Baseline Data:

“Regular classroom” placements have increased 3.4% over the past five years while the “self-contained” placements and “Separate Facility” have decreased just over 1.3%. During the same timeframe, there has been a decrease of 2.1% for students who spend more than 20% but less than 60% of their time outside of the regular classroom. The data represent the improvement in inclusion that supports students with disabilities.

The long-standing assertion in special education literature is that students with disabilities included in the regular classroom activities and academics perform better than those taught outside the regular classroom. Data confirm that State practices and procedures are increasing the rate of inclusion of students with disabilities into the regular classroom. Focused monitoring uses this measure as one of its factors for school selection, so there is a systemic influence that may be nudging practice toward increasing inclusion into the regular classroom.

National data for the year 2003 (the latest posted) show that Maine’s “regular class” inclusion rate of 53.8% is slightly above the National average of 49.9%. Twenty-three (23) states report higher inclusion rates than Maine. Eighteen (18) states place a higher percentage of their students outside the regular classroom greater than 60% of the time. Thirty-nine (39) states place a lower percentage of their students in separate facilities than does Maine. This places Maine in the middle of the states in terms of performance overall.

The stakeholder group considered the data at length, indicating various reactions. Some consider the State’s performance to be quite good, and would allow a decrease in the inclusion percentage. Others felt that continued improvement in inclusion in the regular classroom would support improvement of scholastic performance of students with disabilities. Both positions have merit, but continuing to increase the percentage students with disabilities served in regular classroom settings remains a priority for the Department. The Measurable and Rigorous Targets project improvement in the primary inclusion objective, with smaller changes in remote placements.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target		
	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements
2005 (2005-2006)	**Greater than 60%**	**Less than 12%**	**Less than 4%**
2006 (2006-2007)	**Greater than 61%**	**Less than 11%**	**Less than 4%**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target		
	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements
2007 (2007-2008)	**Greater than 62%**	**Less than 10%**	**Less than 3.7%**
2008 (2008-2009)	**Greater than 63%**	**Less than 9%**	**Less than 3.5%**
2009 (2009-2010)	**Greater than 64%**	**Less than 9%**	**Less than 3.3%**
2010 (2010-2011)	**Greater than 65%**	**Less than 9%**	**Less than 3.1%**
2011 (2011-2012)	**Greater than 65%**	**Less than 9%**	**Less than 3.1%**
2012 (2012-2013)	**Greater than 65%**	**Less than 9%**	**Less than 3.1%**

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
Use state required forms for IEP eligibility and placement determinations		X	X	X	X	X			
Continue staff development efforts in differentiated instruction techniques, inclusion strategies, tolerance, assistive technology and other supportive approaches for the classroom		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	MDOE
Use Communities of Practice to improve and increase sharing among school systems to broaden the use of best practices and build more equity among LEAs			X	X	X	X			
Build collaborative structures, incentives and supports between the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Education to reduce the number of State Agency Clients, State Wards, and other students at risk who are placed in separate facilities rather than typical classroom settings.			X	X	X	X	X	X	MDOE

Provide annual updates to the data definitions and data collection instructions for Part B data collections		X	X	X	X	X			
Each LEA with a determination of Needs Assistance or lower will be required to complete an in-depth self-assessment of this indicator				X	X	X	X	X	GSST

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and

B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Baseline data will be determined as collection and measurement of these data are defined.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

To be reestablished as collection and measurement of these data are defined.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	At least **81%** of Children 3-5 receiving services in settings with typically developing peers. (based on the original definitions of these data and measurement criteria)
2006 (2006-2007)	**Not reported**
2007 (2007-2008)	**Not reported**
2008 (2008-2009)	**Not reported**
2009 (2009-2010)	**Not reported**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010 (2010-2011)	Not reported
2011 (2011-2012)	To be determined
2012 (2012-2013)	To be determined

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
As changes continue in the CDS system, the State will monitor settings data to assure that children are served in the least restrictive environment.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST
Professional development contractors will provide training to individuals who develop IFSP/IEPs on strategies to get services needed to support children's needs.	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Data personnel in the reporting sites will continue to receive regular professional development to assure that the data sustains high accuracy regarding settings' data definitions.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Maine SLDS
State program and data personnel will monitor and assess data collection methods, data definitions, and reporting requirements to ensure consistent and compatible criteria are applied for all children.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST
CDS Sites will continue to recruit and retain qualified service providers throughout the state in order to assure availability of service in all communities and rural regions.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	CDS Sites

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

Measurement:

Outcomes:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d) divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e) divided by [the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

Baseline Data for Preschool Children Exiting in FFY 2008

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	19	7.4
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	60	23.3
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	83	32.3
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	52	20.2
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	43	16.7
Total	N=257	100%
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	21	8.2
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	55	21.4
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	90	35.0
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	54	21.0
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	37	14.4
Total	N=257	100%
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	18	7.0
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	55	24.0
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	53	20.6
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	49	19.1
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained	82	31.9

functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers		
Total	N=257	100%

Baseline Data for Preschool Children Exiting in FFY 2008

Summary Statements	% of children
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	63.1
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	37.0

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	65.5
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	35.4
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	58.3
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	51.0

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

CDS has been involved in the use of the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) since 2005. Since that time we have moved from three sites piloting the COSF to all sites submitting the COSF. The state has adopted the use of the ECO COSF with minor adaptations to the identifying information. Training has occurred with staff from ECO and NECTAC on two occasions.

Trainings with ECO and NECTAC occurred in January 2007 and in November 2008. Since that time ongoing technical assistance has occurred through Lunch and Learn sessions and by regular contact between the CDS State IEU and the regional site personnel. The first Administrative Letter that was given to the regional sites indicates their responsibility for COSF was effective April 1, 2007 (Administrative Letter #2). An updated Administrative Letter has gone into effect as of February 4, 2009 (Administrative Letter #14). With Administrative Letter #14 regional sites were provided with an updated decision tree, guidelines, and a developmental milestone checklist. The most recent guidance documents were developed by personnel who attended the November 2008 training. Since that training we have moved from having all COSFs submitted on paper with a staff person at the CDS State IEU entering them into a database to having all the forms submitted electronically. This transition has provided CDS State IEU staff additional time to review the information being submitted for accuracy and completeness. The form has been modified throughout the year to ensure information collected is accurate and reliable. In FFY2007, 59 children were assessed and in FFY2008 121 children were assessed.

In addition to the technical assistance and training provided to the regional site personnel, the CDS State IEU has been chosen to be one of the 9 Framework Partner States through ECO. With the assistance of Maine's ECO support team, the CDS State IEU has identified goals to help move our COSF system even further. Over the next two years, as part of the framework partnership, we will assist ECO to develop their COSF Framework and they will assist us to develop parent friendly information, develop strategies to make the COSF process included into the IFSP/IEP process, and assist us to develop training materials. The CDS State IEU will use the materials to provide training to all Early Care and Education personnel in Maine on the understanding and importance of Child and Family Outcomes. In June of 2009 the birth to five consultant for Intervention, Programming and Staff Development attended the National Outcomes and Data Conferences. She presented with an ECO Representative and two other states at the Outcomes Conference on COSF Quality Assurance. The birth to five consultant for Intervention, Programming, and Staff Development will ensure this process continues on its path of growth.

The outcome measure system for Maine includes:

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

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

The population of children for whom outcome data is collected includes all children aged 0-5 who are determined eligible for services and who have an IFSP or IEP. Entry, annual and exit information is gathered on all children who have been in services for more than six months.

A full and individualized evaluation of a child's present level of functioning must be conducted to determine eligibility prior to entry into the CDS system. In 2005, work was begun to clarify the necessary distinctions in eligibility between IDEA Part C and Part B 619 children. The Assessment Committee has reviewed various early childhood assessment systems and has created a list of acceptable assessments

for children aged 3-5. In FFY2008 CDS State IEU, MDOE and Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities held regional conferences for CDS sites, providers and PreK- 3 public school educators and administrators. As part of this conference, acceptable assessments will be discussed.

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

The Case Manager (service coordinator) is responsible for collecting and documenting enough information for the team to be able to determine the early childhood outcomes rating for the child (on a scale of 1-7 on the Child Outcomes Summary Form). This discussion is becoming a natural part of the IFSP/IEP meeting. The information gathered 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 to administrators and service providers in outcome data collection, reporting, and use

Technical assistance (TA) occurs frequently and is available at any time for all site personnel. An example of the continuous availability for TA is when the COSFs are submitted. At that time, they are reviewed for accuracy. If there is information that is omitted, misplaced, missing, incomplete, inaccurate or unclear the form is returned to the Site Director and/or Case Manager to be reviewed, completed and resubmitted. If the corrections needed are not clear then the Data Distinguished Educator provides TA to the personnel to ensure their competence in the area. The Programming, Intervention, Staff Development and Monitoring consultant is also available to provide TA to all sites and site personnel. CDS has a training committee that meets monthly to discuss training needs for the system. The training committee recommended that Lunch and Learn sessions be conducted as a refresher to staff as follow up to the November 2008 training done by NECTAC/ECO.

Maine has been selected as one of the seven Framework Partner States with the Early Childhood Outcomes Center. This relationship has been an extremely valuable resource in providing our sites with up to date information and assistance. A representative from ECO met with our Training Committee to discuss implementation processes, usage of, barriers and needs in relation to the COSF. The information gathered was used in developing the Lunch and Learn refresher and is being used to develop information to be shared with the personnel required to monitor and complete the COSF.

The CDS website (http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/cds/cosf/index.html) has been an area of value in providing information and resources in relation to outcomes. Policy statements (Administrative Letter #14), guidance documents, sample Developmental Milestones, Maine's Early Learning and Infant Toddler Guidelines, COSF, and useful resources are all available on the website. By the end of the year we expect to have completed Training Modules available for training and orientation purposes. Additionally, the CDS State IEU is developing a COSF monitoring checklist to be used when monitoring files. The checklist will be used as part of an onsite visit for a focused monitoring or for the regional site to review their COSF submissions.

In our work with the Framework we are discussing preparation of information to share with parents and staff to ensure understanding of the process used in Maine and how it is beneficial to their child. CDS State IEU staff will work with professionals throughout the Early Care and Education system to support understanding of the outcome data we are tracking and its use to foster growth and performance in programs.

C. Quality assurance and monitoring procedures to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the outcome data
As a part of the CDS monitoring process the file audit form and review ensure outcome information is included in the file. The information submitted is reviewed by the Data Distinguished Educator for completeness prior to entry into the central database. Error checks are built into the data system. Some regional sites have established internal monitoring and review processes prior to submission of the forms to the CDS State IEU.

Over the next year, one of the reports that the CDS State IEU will develop, to assist all of the Regional Site Directors, will include the children who have entered services and who do not have a COSF, if there has been over a year since an updated COSF has been submitted, and if children have exited and a COSF has not been submitted. This report will provide follow up to sites to ensure they are submitting the information required.

The CDS State IEU is developing a COSF monitoring checklist to be used when monitoring files. The checklist will be utilized as part of an on site visit for a focused monitoring or for the regional site to review their COSF submissions.

D. Data system elements for outcome data input and maintenance, and outcome data analysis
Data continues to be collected, entered and analyzed by the CDS State IEU. The electronic COSFs are submitted to the central office via email. Currently, all sites are submitting forms via email. The COSFs are completed in a standardized MS Word form that is updated on an as needed basis. Streamlining the process from a written process to electronic process has increased the validity of the COSF data, since human interaction has decreased. The State IEU reviews each form submitted for complete information prior to being entered into a central database. The forms are then electronically imported into the central database which is linked to Case-e to verify the information against the child record, previous COSF records, etc. This is an interim process being used while a web based system continues to be developed. Reports based on the data can be produced for other purposes by site or by child and or site.

E. Measurement strategies used to collect data

In Maine all children aged 0-5 who receive Early Intervention Services receive an entry COSF. If children are in services for more than six months they then have a COSF done annually and at exit (from services or from Part C to Part B). For children in Part C they must receive either the Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI) or the Bailey evaluation (Administrative Letter #1, March 16, 2007). In addition to the Bayley or the Battelle, teams use observation, other evaluation and assessment tools, screening information and other input from the team members. The assessments/evaluations are conducted by appropriately certified/trained individuals. Maine uses the COSF developed by ECO using the seven point rating scale. We have made state specific additions to the form which can be found at http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/cds/forms/cosf.doc. All data is reported to the CDS State IEU. For this reporting year the forms have been submitted both electronically and through paper copies mail to the central office. One person in the central office is responsible for inserting all information into an internal database. The data has been analyzed using the ECO calculator, the state database and by CDS State IEU individuals.

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

a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning:
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers;
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same aged peers but did not reach it;
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same age peers; and

e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same aged peers.

CDS central office will analyze the entry status of children, exit status, and the percentages of children who increased ratings from entry data to exit data (moved nearer to typical development) by site as well as by state.

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

Maine utilize ECO COSF form where the rating 6 and 7 have been defined as the area that meets the OSEP definition requirement for "comparable to same aged peers".

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Maine has chosen to use the ECO Summary Statements Calculator to generate the baseline data for the table below. Data from the progress charts above are entered into the calculator for each outcome, and the calculator yields the percentages for the Summary Statements table.

Progress Data for Infants and Toddlers Exiting 2008-2009

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	19	7.4
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	60	23.3
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	83	32.3
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	52	20.2
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	43	16.7
Total	N=257	100%
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	21	8.2
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	55	21.4
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	90	35.0
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	54	21.0
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	37	14.4
Total	N=257	100%
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	18	7.0

b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	55	21.4
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	53	20.6
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	49	19.1
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	82	31.9
Total	N=257	100%

Baseline Data for Infants and Toddlers Exiting 2008-2009

Summary Statements	% of children
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	63.1
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	37.0

Summary Statements	% of children
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	65.5
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	35.4
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	58.3
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	51.0

Explanation of currently reported progress data
This year's baseline data is based on 257 children who have exited, however, the intent is for all children to receive an initial, annual and/or exit Child Outcomes Summary Form completed. Therefore, the data is a representation of the children in the CDS program from all 16 regional sites. As previously mentioned, reports will be develop, to assist the regional sites in determining children who have entered services and who do not have a COSF, if there has been over a year since an updated COSF has been submitted, and if children have exited and a COSF has not been submitted. The reports will enable the sites to collect data on all children for future analysis and increase data quality.

A comparison from FFY2007 progress data to FFY2008 baseline data, shows an increase in the number of children reported for outcomes. Correspondingly, the percentage of children who did not improve functioning in FFY2007 has decreased in FFY2008 in all three outcome areas. This trend should continue based on more accurate data as staff continues to improve the quality, accuracy, and timeliness of the forms completed.

Measurable and Rigorous Target:

Targets for Infants and Toddlers Exiting in FFY 2009 (2009-10) and FFY 2010 (2010-2011) and Reported in Feb 2011 and Feb 2012

Summary Statements	Targets for FFY 2009 (% of children)	Targets for FFY 2010 (% of children)	Targets for FFY 2011 (% of children)	Targets for FFY 2012 (% of children)
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)				
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	63	64	64	64
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	37	38	38	38
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)				
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	66	67	67	67
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	35	36	36	36
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs				
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	58	59	59	59
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	51	52	52	52

Targets for FFY2009 and FFY2010 have been set based on evaluation of our baseline data.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
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	X	X	CDS Sites
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	X	X	Data Management Team
Continuing training and professional development			X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

Measurement:

Percent = # of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities divided by the total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Instead of piloting a parent survey to a few districts as was outlined in the initial SPP submission, a *census survey* was conducted with all parents of children receiving Part B services. This included both parents of school age children as well as pre-school (Part B619) children. This addresses the issue raised in OSEP Table A:

A request for parent contact information for students receiving was sent to superintendents of all (159) school districts. Information was returned for 146 (92%) of the districts. This yielded contact information for 32,607 parents of Part B school age students. Contact information for Part B 619 students was obtained from an internal database, yielding a parent population of 4,455.

Survey questions were developed around a modified NCSEAM parent survey by using 18 questions from the “Schools Efforts to Partner with Parents” scale. A cover letter, a copy of the survey, and a self-addressed stamped return envelop was sent to all parents during the last week of June 2006.

Envelops included a “Return Service Requested” stamp so that any incorrect address was automatically returned to MDOE rather than sent to a forwarding address. This yielded two groups of incorrect address returns, one that contained a forwarding address and a second for which no forwarding address was available. A second set of envelops was printed for those with forwarding addresses and a second mailing was done during the third week of November.

Discussion of Survey Dissemination/Collection:

Surveys will be sent to ALL parents of students with disabilities attending districts scheduled for program review monitoring in a given year. Maine’s monitoring cycle is six years; every district in the state undergoes program review monitoring to ensure compliance with IDEA within the six year cycle. By this method of selection, a census of parents of children with disabilities is gathered over a six period, approximately one-sixth of the total population per year.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Six-thousand-nine-hundred-forty-five Part B surveys were returned yielding a return rate of 21% whereas 1015 B 619 surveys were returned for a return rate of 23%.

	Part B	B 619
Total Surveys Sent	32607	4455
# Surveys Returned	6945	1015
Return Rate	21%	23%

To determine the representativeness of the sample, the return rate for gender was used. As the table below indicates, the returns were very representative of both the Part B and B 619 populations

	Part B		Part B 619	
	Population	Sample	Population	Sample
Male	66.4%	67.8%	69.2%	69.2%
Female	31.4%	32.3%	30.3%	30.8%

A stakeholder group was asked to review each of the questions and to rank them in order of which question they believed most directly represented the "schools efforts to partner with parents." They were asked to score the questions from 1 to 18, with 18 being the score of the most representative question. The question deemed most representative for the Part B survey was "Those involved in my child's IEP meetings seek out my input." For the B 619 survey, the representative question was "CDS staff treat me as a team member."

Discussion of Baseline Data:

To determine the percentage of respondents in agreement with the target question, viz., "Those involved in my child's IEP meetings seek out my input", the NCSEAM standard setting process was used. First surveys were scored on a 1-4 basis[1]. This resulted in a possible range of scores from 0 (if someone answered "Never" to all 18 questions) to 72 (if someone answered "Always" to all 18 questions). To determine the percentage of agreement with the target question, the number of 3s and 4s were summed across all respondents then converted from a 72 point to 100 point scale. The results for all 18 questions were then ranked from lowest to highest percentage of agreement, and a line was drawn representing the percentage agreement with the target question. This method resulted in the distribution shown below, a distribution that indicates 85% of the respondents agreed with the target question or, more generally, that 85% of the respondents indicated that "schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities."

[1] Never = 1, Rarely = 2, Often = 3, Always = 4.



For the Part B 619 parent, the question stakeholders believed most characterized schools efforts to facilitate parent involvement was “CDS (Child Development Services) staff treat me as a team member.” When the same methods used above were applied to the 619 results, the distribution shown below was the result.



Here the results indicate that 94% of parents believed that the Child Development Service (CDS) site facilitated their involvement.

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (2011-2012)	**91%** of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.
2012 (2012-2013)	**91%** of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
Develop statewide distribution and collection system for surveys.		X							
MDOE will analyze and interpret the data.		X							
Review the projected annual measurable and rigorous targets		X							
Distribute State and local results disaggregated by SAU and by CDS site on the website, through media and to public agencies.		X							
Provide technical assistance and professional development workshops using Maine's parent network system.			X	X	X	X	X	X	Maine Parent Federation
Continue statewide distribution and collection system.			X	X	X	X	X	X	MDOE
Review the annual data reaching for the measurable and rigorous targets with the stakeholders group.			X	X	X	X	X	X	Maine Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities
Contract a parent organization to sustain survey data collection				X	X	X	X	X	MDOE

Monitoring Priority:

Disproportionality

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Measurement:

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

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Disproportionality of ethnic representation at the LEA level can be computed from our current data collections. The intent of measuring disproportionality is to assure that procedures and practices for identification of students with disabilities are consistently applied to all students in all ethnic categories in all LEAs. An LEA would be identified as having "disproportionate representation" if its rate of identification for special education services for students in its population was significantly different than the identification rates in the overall State population as weighted by the local community ethnic representation.

Maine has extremely small populations of non-white students in its LEAs and widely varying ethnic proportions in its communities. Of the 33,282 special education students enrolled in Maine's public schools, only 1426 (4.2%) are non-white. 458 (32%) non-white special education students are located in three communities in the state.

Disproportionate Representation:

Maine applies a mathematical and graphical analysis to disproportionality called proportion analysis. Proportion analysis is a method of comparing a collection of means, rates, or proportions to see if any of them are significantly different from the overall mean, rate, or proportion. Maine has relatively small non-Caucasian populations that are clustered in communities within the state, causing significantly variant proportions of non-Caucasian form LEA to LEA in the state. Comparison of local populations to state populations is inappropriate. However, it is quite appropriate to evaluate the identifications rates of students in ethnic group in special education to the ethnic proportions of the population within the LEA. The LEA population is reflective of the community population and can be compared locally. An example

of proportion analysis as applies to ethnic representation in special education for one of Maine's largest LEAs is shown below.

	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic	Caucasian	Grand Total
Selected LEA Total Population	34	66	628	94	3745	4567
Selected LEA Special Education Population			97	17	735	857
LEA proportion	0.7%	1.4%	13.8%	2.1%	82.0%	
LEA Special Education Population			11.3%	2.0%	85.8%	
Upper Bound			23.4%	12.2%	85.9%	
Lower Bound			4.1%	0.0%	78.1%	



Note that fewer than ten American Indian students or Asian students are identified as special education in the LEA, so their data are suppressed. Populations of fewer that ten are not evaluated to determine disproportionate representation.

The data are graphed on two separate numeric scales because the relative differences and bound ranges for non-Caucasians are indistinguishable when viewed in comparison to Caucasians. The upper bound is the highest percentage of special education students of the particular ethnicity that would still be considered to be similar to the overall LEA percentage of the ethnic group. If the special education percentage exceeded the general population percentage by more than the percentage shown as the upper bound, then that representation would be considered to be disproportionately over-represented. Similarly, special education percentages below the lower bound would be considered disproportionately under-represented. Either condition would flag the LEA for audit of their policies, procedures and practices associated with identification.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

The proportion analysis calculation was applied to the districts in Maine with greater than 10 students in ANY ethnic group. One (1) LEA shows a possible disproportionate representation of Caucasian students.

Baseline Data: 1/155*100 = 0.6%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Analysis of the data for 2005-2006 indicates that a single district in the state exhibit significant disproportionality in selection of Caucasian students receiving special education services when compared with the LEA population. A specially scheduled monitoring review of the district was completed to determine that the LEA appropriately identified the students for special education services. All policies, procedures and practices in the referral, evaluation and identification process within the district were found to be educationally appropriate, consistent with the requirements of Part B and are race neutral.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	**0%** of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services resulting from inappropriate identification.
2006 (2006-2007)	**0%** of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services resulting from inappropriate identification.
2007 (2007-2008)	**0%** of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services resulting from inappropriate identification.
2008 (2008-2009)	**0%** of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services resulting from inappropriate identification.
2009 (2009-2010)	**0%** of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services resulting from inappropriate identification.
2010 (2010-2011)	**0%** of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services resulting from inappropriate identification.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (2011-2012)	**0%** of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services resulting from inappropriate identification.
2012 (2012-2013)	**0%** of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services resulting from inappropriate identification.

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
LEAs with disproportionate representation in special education will be added to the list of focused monitoring visits for the year, or a specific visit will be scheduled to determine that all policies, procedures and practices in the referral, evaluation and identification process are educationally appropriate, consistent with the requirements of Part B and are race neutral.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST
Disproportionate representation will be analyze and disaggregated by LEA. These data will be integrated into the LEA performance profile and used in part to assign determination levels to the LEAs.			X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Measurement:

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

Disproportionate representation is defined as statistically significant difference between the identification rates of students with disabilities in a specific disability category by ethnic proportion and the ethnic proportional representation overall within the LEA. A statistically significant difference is defined as three times the standard deviation estimate for the specific subgroup population. See definition and description of Disproportionate Representation analysis below.

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Disproportionality of ethnic representation at the LEA level can be computed from our current data collections. The intent of measuring disproportionality is to assure that procedures and practices for identification of students with disabilities are consistently applied to all students in all ethnic categories in all LEAs. An LEA would be identified as having "disproportionate representation" if its rate of identification for specific disability categories for students in its population was significantly different than the identification rates in the overall State population as weighted by the local community ethnic representation.

Ethnic populations in Maine LEAs are very small so to assure personally identifiable data are not disclosed, a minimum number of students must be represented in the LEA population within specific disability categories. Maine will only measure those disabilities with more than 1% of the total population represented. The calculation of disproportionality will be applied to only those LEAs with total special education enrollment greater than twenty students and ethnic populations greater than ten students in any non-white ethnic group for each disability.

Disproportionate Representation:

Maine applies a mathematical and graphical analysis to disproportionality called proportion analysis. Proportion analysis is a method of comparing a collection of means, rates, or proportions to see if any of them are significantly different from the overall mean, rate, or proportion. Maine has relatively small non-Caucasian populations that are clustered in communities within the state, causing significantly variant proportions of non-Caucasian form LEA to LEA in the state. Comparison of local populations to state populations is inappropriate. However, it is quite appropriate to evaluate the identifications rates of students in ethnic group in special education to the ethnic proportions of the population within the LEA. The LEA population is reflective of the community population and can be compared locally. An example

of proportion analysis as applies to ethnic representation in special education for one of Maine's largest LEAs is shown below. Note that fewer than ten American Indian students or Asian students are identified as special education, so their data are suppressed. Populations of fewer that ten are not evaluated to determine disproportionate representation.

The Speech Language subgroup from the same LEA was selected for demonstration in the chart below. Again, data are suppressed for population values below ten.

Speech Language Impairment by LEA and Ethnicity

	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic	Caucasian	Grand Total
Selected LEA Total Population	34	66	628	94	3745	4567
Selected LEA Special Education Population			13		113	133
LEA proportion	0.7%	1.4%	13.8%	2.1%	82.0%	
LEA Special Education Population			9.8%		85.0%	
Upper Bound			38.5%		92.1%	
Lower Bound			0.0%		71.9%	

The upper and lower bounds bracket the range of percentage values that would be considered to be similar to the overall percentages in the general population. Percentages outside those bounds would be considered to be disproportionately represented and would flag the LEA for audit of their policies, procedures and practices associated with identification in specific disability categories.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2005-2006):

The proportion analysis calculation was applied to the districts in Maine with greater than 10 students in any non-white ethnic group for each disability, had more than twenty students total in special education, with more than 1% of the total population represented in the disability category. Three (3) LEAs in the state meet the minimum population requirements in specific disabilities (Emotional Disabilities, Multiple Disabilities, Other Health Impairment, Specific Learning Disability, and Speech and Language Impairment. One (1) of those LEAs shows a possible disproportionate representation of Caucasian students in specific disabilities (Multiple Disabilities, Other Health Impairment, Specific Learning Disability, and Speech and Language Impairment).

Baseline Data: 1/155*100 = 0.6%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Analysis of the data for 2005-2006 indicates that a single district in the state exhibit significant disproportionality in selection of Caucasian students identified in four disability categories when compared with the LEA population percentage for Caucasian students. A specially scheduled monitoring review of the district was completed to determine that the LEA appropriately identified the students for special education services. All policies, procedures and practices in the referral, evaluation and identification process within the district were found to be educationally appropriate, consistent with the requirements of Part B and are race neutral.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	**0%** of school districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2006 (2006-2007)	**0%** of school districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2007 (2007-2008)	**0%** of school districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2008 (2008-2009)	**0%** of school districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2009 (2009-2010)	**0%** of school districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2010 (2010-2011)	**0%** of school districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2011 (2011-2012)	**0%** of school districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2012 (2012-2013)	**0%** of school districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
LEAs with disproportionate representation in special education will be added to the list of focused monitoring visits for the year, or a specific visit will be scheduled to determine that all policies, procedures and practices in the referral, evaluation and identification process are educationally appropriate, consistent with the requirements of Part B and are race neutral.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
Disproportionate representation will be analyze and disaggregated by LEA. These data will be integrated into the LEA performance profile and used in part to assign determination levels to the LEAs.			X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST

Monitoring Priority

Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

Measurement:

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Note: 05-071 Chapter 101, Maine Unified Special Education Regulation (page 36) establishes timelines for initial evaluation in section V.1.A.(3)(a)(i) as follows: "To determine whether a child is a child with a disability (as defined in 20 USC 1402) *within 60 calendar days of receiving parental consent for the evaluation for children in the Child Development Services System and* within *45 school* days of receiving parental consent for the evaluation *for children 5-20 years of age under the responsibility of the public school system*".

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Current program review monitoring procedures verify compliance with State established timeliness for evaluating and determination of eligibility in a selected group of Individualized Education Program (IEP) files each year. The program review monitoring process will continue to collect these data. The State established timeline is 45 school days from the date the Local Education Agency (LEA) receives written parental consent to the date of the Pupil Evaluation Team (PET) meeting is conducted to determine eligibility. Measurement of this compliance requirement is determined by monitoring of student records.

Monitoring processes are multi-phased and use the same measurements for the Part B 619 (ages 3-5) children as are applied to the school-age (ages 6-20) students, but the items used during review for each age group vary as applicable to the age group. CDS central office personnel monitor CDS sites for compliance during on-site file reviews for all children aged 0-5. Reviews file files for students aged 3-5 will include verification of compliance with the evaluation timeline for the 3 to 5 age group (60 calendar days). Self-assessment is conducted by the school-age LEAs using technical assistance, training and guidance from the LEA monitoring team. A total of 50 specific criteria are included in the "Child Record Audit Form" used as the mechanism for the self-assessment; item #13 is "Written Notice that a determination of eligibility was made within 45 school days from receipt of Parental Consent for Evaluation for 5-20"l; #14 is "14. Written Notice that a determination of eligibility was made within 60 calendar days from receipt of Parental Consent for Evaluation for 3-5".

Data are reported internally at all levels of review, but the on-site review of timelines is used as the basis for compliance determination. The percentage of student records found to be in compliance upon the on-site visit review of student files is determined by the counting the number of files found to be compliant to the timeline and dividing that by the number of files reviewed during the on-site monitoring visit.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

The Maine State Monitoring Review Team performed on-site reviews of 22 LEAs during the 2005-2006 school year, resulting in detailed review of 908 individual student Individualized Education Program documents. 254 documents were found to contain referral requirements and parent consent to evaluate, and 217 were found to comply with the 45 school day timeline requirement; a rate of compliance of **85%** (217/254). 8 of the 21 LEAs reviewed accounted for all non-compliant documents. Each monitoring review resulted in detailed corrective action letter describing each non-conformance with required improvements, remediation, and follow-up documentation to validate completion.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

This is a compliance indicator so the target is set at 100%.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	**100%** of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline).
2006 (2006-2007)	**100%** of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline).
2007 (2007-2008)	**100%** of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline).
2008 (2008-2009)	**100%** of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline).
2009 (2009-2010)	**100%** of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline).
2010 (2010-2011)	**100%** of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline).
2011 (2011-2012)	**100%** of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline).
2012 (2012-2013)	**100%** of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline).

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
Program reviews performed on site at each LEA once every five years.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
Technical assistance and professional development will be provided to LEAs who have not met the target.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST

Monitoring Priority

Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

Measurement:

a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.

b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.

c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.

e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e)] times 100.

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Maine currently has a seamless system 0-5. Chapter 180(IX.7) currently states: "The regional site Board is responsible for ensuring that all children age 2 who have been identified through the Child Find process as meeting the eligibility criteria for early intervention services have an ECT meeting, at least ninety (90) days prior to the child's third birthday, for the purpose of developing an IFSP/IEP for implementation at no cost to the family when the child turns age 3."

- Children ages 0-2 in Maine are eligible if they meet the criteria for "Developmental Delay", the only disability category for that group. The fourteen disability categories for children 3-5 include "Developmental Delay" with the same set of qualifying criteria as 0-2

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The data below provide an accounting of children who exited Part C to Part B 619 in the specified time frame.

Table 12.1: Children Exited to Part B 619 12/2/03 - 12/1/04

Children Exited to Part B 619	Children	Percent
Total	1281	100%
Eligible for Part B 619	1234	96%
Not Eligible for Part B 619	2	0%
Undetermined	45	4%

Table 12.1 is based on the OSEP Part C Child Count Table 3 submitted to OSEP in October of 2005.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

a. The children served in Part C and referred to Part B 619 is represented by the “Total”, that is 1,281 children.
b. The number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays is represented by “Not Eligible for Part B 619”, 2 children.
c. The number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays is represented by “Eligible for Part B 619” 1,234.

There were also in the data 45 children who turned 3 but whose Part B 619 eligibility was “Undetermined”. Those children have left the CDS System or their Part B 619 eligibility would be known.

As is mentioned above, current policies require that existing plans be reviewed and modified before transition so that existing services are uninterrupted by transition to Part B 619. That means that all children have implemented IFSP/IEPs at transition.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	**100%** of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2006 (2006-2007)	**100%** of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2007 (2007-2008)	**100%** of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2008 (2008-2009)	**100%** of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2009 (2009-2010)	**100%** of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2010 (2010-2011)	**100%** of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2011 (2011-2012)	**100%** of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2012 (2012-2013)	**100%** of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
Monitor sites for compliance and verify data and data entry. Based on findings, continue to provide ongoing professional development and trainings to enhance understanding and compliance.		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100 **= [(1100)/(1246)]*100 = 88**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY2009
2009	*100% of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs.*
FFY	**Actual Target Data for FFY2009**
2009	88% of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Program monitoring procedures verify measurable transition goals in a selected group of Individualized Education Program (IEP) files each year. The program monitoring process will continue to collect these data with a clear definition of "measurable goals." Provisions for student invitation to the IEP meeting and framework for the development of appropriate goals are integrated into the design of Maine's require state IEP form. The IEP required form (and all special education required forms) is announced each year by a letter from the Commissioner and is posted on the MDOE website for LEAs to copy and use (http://www.maine.gov/education/forms/specservices.htm).

Baseline Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):

The Maine State Monitoring Review Team performed on-site reviews of 48 LEAs during the 2009-2010 school year, with 1639 student Individualized Education Program documents. Of those, 1246 documents were found to contain requirements for students age 16 or older and 1100 were found to comply with the transition goals and services requirement; a rate of compliance of 88% (1100/1246). All non-compliant documents were found in 26 of the 48 LEAs reviewed. Those LEAs found non-compliant to indicator 13 requirements was required to create a corrective action plan within 60 calendar days of the letter of findings. The plans have been submitted to the Maine Department of Education, have been reviewed, and approval granted. Progress to those corrective action plans is being monitored by the program review staff to ensure correction is timely and meets the OSEP memo 09-02 requirements. Immediate action was taken in every non-compliant LEA to ensure that IEP transition goals for all students with violations; data have been review by program review personnel to ensure the corrections were completed. As a condition of approval, corrective action plans submitted were required to address the cause for lack of appropriate transition goals or associated requirements, which all addressed. Completion of the corrective actions is required to be submitted in writing with evidence or assurance of implementation of the planned corrections. Determinations for the FFY2009 indicators will include the indicator 13 non-compliance indication, which will result in “Needs Assistance” determination at best for each of the 26 LEAs with findings. The determination response for indicator 13 non-compliance will require each LEA to review a representative sample of files for transition goal compliance using more recent files (updated data) to ensure the corrective actions implemented in response to their findings of non-compliance this year have resulted in files compliant to the transition goal requirement.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data indicate that schools have appropriate systems in place to assure the inclusion of transition goals in IEP files. Training support will be provided to those LEAs exhibiting need for improvement.

This is a compliance indicator so the target is set at 100%.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs.
2011 (2011-2012)	100% of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs.
2012 (2012-2013)	100% of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
Monitoring reviews performed on site at each LEA once every six years.						X	X	X	GSST
Technical assistance and professional development will be provided to LEAs who have not met the target.						X	X	X	GSST
Review the protocol and specific questions used in program monitoring to capture data on the assessment of the number of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals						X	X		MDOE

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measurement:

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100 = [(210)/(591)]*100 = 35.5

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100 = [(210+334)/(591)]*100 = 92.0

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100 = [(210+317+15)/(591)]*100 = 94.6

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

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

It was decided to survey all students with IEPs in order to establish a baseline for this indicator in the original development of the indicator targets and improvement activities. The target population for those exiting school in the 2004-05 school year was 2,097 youth in all exit categories (graduated, dropped out, aged out, etc.). Contact information was requested for these students and eventually a total of 626 were successfully contacted. Of these, 129 refused to take the survey leaving a respondent sample 497. The data collected were used as the baseline for FFY2005.

A similar process has been employed for each year since 2005 selecting students exiting from those LEAs scheduled for program review in the following year. Data collection was conducted one year after the cohort group exited high school, and the data were provided to LEAs during their program review.

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

original survey design and question structure are compatible with the new measurement format; the data must be pooled into the three measurement categories.

A. Data responding to measurement subpart A is the response to, “ARE YOU IN SCHOOL NOW?” In school from this response is defined as enrolled in at least a single semester or module in a two-year, or four-year institution of higher education. In-state institutions of higher education include community colleges, public university locations, and private colleges. The number of young adults responding with “yes” answers will be divided by the total number of exiters from the selected LEAs for the year.

B. Data responding to measurement subpart B will sum the data from A above with the responses to the questions: “DO YOU CURRENTLY HAVE A PAYING JOB?” answered “yes” and “WHAT IS YOUR SALARY ON THIS JOB?” answered “Above minimum wage (>$6.50)” plus the answer “yes” to “ARE YOU IN THE MILITARY?”. A paying job is defined as youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

C. Data responding to measurement subpart C will sum the data from B above with the responses to the question, “ARE YOU IN SCHOOL NOW?” where in school includes youth enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least one complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, or vocational technical school which is less than a 2-year program). Also included will be responses to the questions “DO YOU CURRENTLY HAVE A PAYING JOB?” answered “yes” and “WHAT IS YOUR SALARY ON THIS JOB?”, but where employment is defined as youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

Baseline Data from FFY2009:

Data for 2009 graduates was not possible to collect. The agency contracted to collect the data was terminated by legislative action with insufficient time to recover the data collection. However, data for previous years are sufficient to determine baseline performance and establish targets for subsequent years. The collections provided data in disaggregated form that permitted alignment with the new measurement reporting requirements. Those data are included above and form the basis for the Measurable and Rigorous Targets shown in the table below.

During FFY2010, a contract was established with the National Student Clearinghouse to provide the state with data upload and analysis capability that provides individual student higher education enrollment status. Additionally, Maine Department of Education (MDOE) established a collaborative agreement with the Maine Department of Labor provide employment, job training, and unemployment statistics for students identified by the MDOE as exiting high school. These two data sources have been selected and used to provide the data necessary to respond to indicator 14. Data provided to the National Student Clearinghouse and the Maine Department of Labor were the exiting students for the school years 2009-2010. The data window established for the students’ enrollment in higher education, employment, and job training data was the reporting year July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011 (FFY2010).

FFY2010 Performance Revised Baseline		
A.	**B.**	**C.**
25.0%	**76.6%**	**82.3%**

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(227 youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (909 youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100 = **25.0**

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(227 youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education plus 469 competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (909 youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100 = **76.6**

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(227 youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, plus 469 youth in some other postsecondary education or training program; plus 52 competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (909 youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100 = **82.3**

The Part B Indicator Measurement Table requires disaggregation of date into four distinct categories in order to further inform the data shown above. The table below presents the data in the required data disaggregation:

The actual number of "leavers" who are:	**Numbers**
1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;	227
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);	469
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);	11
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	41

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Targets for the new measurement have been established using analysis of data received from the National Student Clearinghouse and the Maine Department of Labor. The targets presented in Measurable and Rigorous Target table for FFY2010 were set based on data presented in the FFY2009 APR. Those data did not provide the required measurement. The June 20, 2011 OSEP APR Response Table required the state to provide, as baseline data, the required data for FFY2010 in the FFY2010 APR, due February 1, 2012. Thos baseline data are provided above. New targets have been established for FFY2011 and FFY2012 based on the baseline established above.

FFY	**Measurable and Rigorous Target**		
2010 (2010-2011)*	A. 35% enrolled in higher education*	B. 92% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed*	C. 94% enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target		
			training program; or competitively employed*
2011 (2011-2012)	A. 25% enrolled in higher education	B. 76.6% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	C. 82.3% enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed
2012 (2012-2013)	A. 25.1% enrolled in higher education	B. 77% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	C. 83% enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed

* Data reported in FFY2009 for indicator 14 did not provide the required measurement; a new baseline and targets were established for FFY2010.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources (through 2012):

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
Monitoring reviews performed on site at each LEA once every will include assessment of LEA level post-school outcomes based on their latest survey data.						X	X	X	GSST
Technical assistance and professional development will be provided to LEAs who have not met the target.						X	X	X	GSST

Monitoring Priority:

Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

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

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Program review monitoring is used by the Maine Department of Education Program Review Team to identify and investigate potential non-compliance at the LEA level using a selection process to identify districts (LEAs) for program review monitoring. Given that district consolidation efforts statewide have reconfigured many schools, consolidated school districts (CSDs), and school unions into combined and disintegrated district entities, program review scheduling had to be reconfigured to ensure no school or schools system exceeded the six year interval for program review monitoring. The following method was used to determine a representative selection plan over the next six years that can work in conjunction with Maine's Program Review cycle.

A. Districts were sorted from oldest to newest in terms of the last program review completed.
B. Any district with an entity (school, collection of schools, or central administrative organization) with a previous review date five years or more, were included in the first cohort.
C. Remaining districts were then sorted based on their previous review dates, and distributed evenly among the subsequent cohorts in order of the previous dates of review, oldest first.
D. The projected schedule of district review dates is posted on the General Supervision Systems Team website http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/gsst/index.html.

Program review is conducted in each district using the state developed Child Record Audit Form (CRAF) as the assessment guide for review of specific requirements of the Maine Uniform Special Education Regulation, Birth to Age Twenty (Maine Code of Rules, 05-071 Chapter 101). Any identified non-compliances discovered are documented by letter to the LEA with the requirement for a corrective action plan to be developed by the LEA for approval by the monitoring team. Written approval of the plan initiates the one year compliance resolution period.

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Seventeen (17) findings were addressed in 2004-2005 as a result of focused monitoring. All seventeen (17) were resolved and closed within twelve (12) months as required. In each case, the LEA was required to provide specific response by a specific date, in no case beyond ninety days from the date of the letter. The data required of the LEA was to submit a Corrective Action Plan detailing their steps for correction along with submission of documents from new referrals showing compliance delivered to the program review office and all LEA data were reviewed by the program review specialist assigned to the LEA. Approval of each corrective action and the supporting data were given in writing once the non-compliance was corrected.

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

Percent = [(number of finding resolved within twelve months) divided by (the number of findings)]

times 100 **= 32 ÷ 33 = 97%**

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Monitoring is operating at 100% compliance during the 2004-2005 year. Corrective action plans were required of 2 LEAs to resolve compliance issues identified during their Program Review Monitoring visits. Both returned documentation of the completion of their corrective actions within 3 months. Due Process compliance to corrective actions within twelve months is 94%. In 2004-2005, sixteen (16) cases required corrective action as a result of due process dispute resolution and fifteen closed within the timeline requirement. The one non-compliant case was resolved in 406 days. The remaining fifteen that took an average 79 days to close; the longest duration was 269 days to close.

This is a compliance measure so the target is set at 100%.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	**100%** noncompliance corrected within one year of identification
2006 (2006-2007)	**100%** noncompliance corrected within one year of identification
2007 (2007-2008)	**100%** noncompliance corrected within one year of identification
2008 (2008-2009)	**100%** noncompliance corrected within one year of identification
2009 (2009-2010)	**100%** noncompliance corrected within one year of identification
2010 (2010-2011)	**100%** noncompliance corrected within one year of identification
2011 (2011-2012)	**100%** noncompliance corrected within one year of identification
2012 (2012-2013)	**100%** noncompliance corrected within one year of identification

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
Continue to employ focused monitoring as the oversight mechanism for assuring adherence to key measurements in the State Performance Plan and State regulatory compliance requirements.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST
Pursue development of management table or monitoring data set to track the various aspects of compliance and performance through the general supervision system.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST
Data collected in the system will continue to be reviewed on a regular basis for improvement opportunities, preventative actions, or interim course correction regarding key measurements in due process and related activities.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	GSST

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Measurement:

Percent = (# complaints with reports issued within timelines + # of complaints issued within extended timelines) divided by (# of complaints with reports issued) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Complaints are tracked in detail using the Due Process Office database (DOCKET). The database includes the report issued date and resolution dates for all complaint investigations. Timeline extensions can be granted under specific guidelines.

The DPO provided training to Complaint Investigators during the spring of 2005.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005)

Table 16.1: Data on Signed, Written Complaints (from Attachment 1)

SECTION A: Signed, written complaints	
(1) Signed, written complaints total	53
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	18
(a) Reports with findings	6
(b) Reports within timeline	10
(c) Reports within extended timelines	5
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	35
(1.3) Complaints pending	0
(a) Complaint pending a due process hearing	0

Percent = 83% [(10+5)/18]

Discussion of Baseline Data:

15 of 18 (83%) complaints were completed within timelines. The three that did not complete within the timeline were completed in 61, 61 and 68 days. They had not been extended because completion on time appeared likely, but staffing issues with complaint investigators caused unexpected delays. Historical performance cannot be computed because we reported data in non-comparable forms over the past 4 years. Compliance to this measure in 2005 is likely. This is a compliance measure so the target is set at 100%.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	**100%** of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	**100%** of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
2007 (2007-2008)	**100%** of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
2008 (2008-2009)	**100%** of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
2009 (2009-2010)	**100%** of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
2010 (2010-2011)	**100%** of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
2011 (2011-2012)	**100%** of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
2012 (2012-2013)	**100%** of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
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	X	X	DPO

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Measurement:

Percent = [(hearing decisions within timeline + hearing decisions within extended timeline) divided by Hearings (fully adjudicated)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Hearings are tracked in detail using the Due Process Office (DPO) database (DOCKET). The database includes the *report issued date* and *resolution dates* for all hearings. Timeline extensions can be granted by the hearing officer at the request of either or both parties. If a hearing officer grants an extension, the hearing officer must provide to the parties and the DPO a new date certain for the issuance of the hearing decision.

Resolution sessions and agreements are new requirements that will be discussed in Indicator 18.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005)

Table 17.1: Data on Hearing Requests (from Attachment 1)

SECTION C: Hearing requests	
(3) Hearing requests total	86
(3.1) Resolution sessions	
(a) Settlement agreements	
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	17
(a) Decisions within timeline	0
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	16
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing (dismissed, mediated or withdrawn)	68

One (1) hearing pending (open).

Percent = 94% [(16/17)]

Discussion of Baseline Data:

One decision was not resolved within the timeline at the time that the Due Process Office had only a single hearing officer. Additional officers have been added since that time.

Historical performance cannot be computed because we reported data in non-comparable forms over the past 4 years. Actions taken this past year have improved performance.

This is a compliance measure so the target is set at 100%.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	**100%** of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
2006 (2006-2007)	**100%** of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
2007 (2007-2008)	**100%** of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
2008 (2008-2009)	**100%** of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
2009 (2009-2010)	**100%** of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
2010 (2010-2011)	**100%** of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
2011 (2011-2012)	**100%** of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
2012 (2012-2013)	**100%** of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
Review data on hearings to monitor rates of agreement		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	DPO

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Measurement:

Percent = # of settlement agreements divided by # of resolution sessions times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

"Resolution sessions" and "Settlement agreements" are counted in due process case data. The Maine Department of Education Due Process Office (DPO) provides a resolution session status form for LEAs to fill out when they have received a request for a hearing from parents. The DPO docket database status drop-down list the following:

1. "Partially resolved resolution session" to indicate that part of the issues brought in a hearing request have been resolved in a resolution session. (NOTE: If the hearing request is withdrawn & the rest of the issues not taken forward for adjudication, the withdrawal of the hearing status would be "withdrawn with & without prejudice". The issues not resolved in the resolution session could be brought to DPO in a new hearing request.)

2. "Resolved resolution session" to indicate that all of the issues brought in a hearing request have been resolved in a resolution session.

3. "Voided" to indicate the LEA or the parents exercised their right to void the resolution session agreement within three business days of the execution of the agreement.

4. "Waived" to indicate the parties have agreed to waive the resolution session & either have chosen to participate in mediation or wish to proceed directly to a due process hearing.

5. "Not applicable" to indicate that the initiating party is the LEA & a resolution session is not required in this sort of hearing or that an expedited hearing has been requested.

6. "DPO decision" to indicate that the DPO has declined to make arrangements for an expedited hearing request for reasons other than disciplinary issues.

7. "Not resolved" to indicate that a resolution session was held but did not result in an agreement.

The Maine DOE Commissioner sent out informational letter #12 in 2005 regarding resolution sessions.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

57% (13 of 23) of meetings conducted resulted in settlement agreements.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The impact of resolution sessions is that they are a less contentious means of reconciling a due process dispute than a hearing or expedited hearing. In that regard, measuring resolution session agreement rates yield an understanding of how likely a plaintiff is to resolve a dispute without escalating to the level of a hearing.

The due process office (DPO) holds the local educational agency (LEA) responsible for:

1) Keeping close track of the receipt of a request for a hearing from a parent;

2) Sending a facsimile of that request to the State educational agency (SEA) on the date the LEA receives it or no later than the close of the next business day;

3) Complying with the timelines for the resolution meeting as well as other applicable timelines at §615(c)(2)(B)(i)(I), §615(c)(2)(B)(ii) and §615(c)(2)(C);

4) Arranging for and holding the resolution meeting unless the LEA and the parents have waived the resolution session, agreed to participate in mediation or decided to go directly to a hearing;

5) Notifying the Maine Department of Education, Due Process Office if the LEA and the parents have waived the resolution session and want to participate in mediation; and

6) Notifying the Maine Department of Education, Due Process Office of the status of the resolution session if the resolution session was held.

The rate of resolution sessions resulting in resolution agreements from January 1, 2006 – June 30, 2006 is 25%. It is unlikely that resolution sessions will be a common method for obtaining agreement between parents and LEAs in the state for a number of reasons. Because LEAs are small in number of students, teachers and buildings, parents have fairly easy access to superintendents and special education directors. Unfortunately, access and familiarity leave the resolution session process looking very much like a repeat of the Pupil Evaluation Team (PET) meeting. Furthermore, resolution sessions do not provide the protection of confidentiality that is available in a mediation. Resolution sessions do not require an impartial presider, and thus far no LEA has chosen to contract with an impartial presider. Parents are frequently opting to resolve their differences with the LEA using methods and mechanisms other than the resolution sessions process. Similar experiences[2] have been documented elsewhere.

Governor Baldacci's budget bill c.2006 decreasing the number of LEAs from 290 to 26 regional centers and the number of superintendents from 192 to 26 is currently being discussed by the legislature and the public. As easy access and familiarity with superintendents and special education directors is diminished with the introduction of regional centers, there may be a moderate increase in requests for resolution sessions.

Maine will continue to monitor closely the usage and rate of settlement emerging from the resolution session process. It is very unlikely that resolutions sessions will grow to become the predominant means of resolution, but improvement from the baseline is anticipated. The performance trajectory predicted begins at the current performance of 25% and improves over the 5 years remain in the plan to a rate that exceeds the baseline performance.

[2] *The Special Educator*, June 23, 2006, pages 4 and 5, 2006 LRP Publications

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	30% of resolution sessions will result in settlement agreements
2007 (2007-2008)	35% of resolution sessions will result in settlement agreements
2008 (2008-2009)	40% of resolution sessions will result in settlement agreements
2009 (2009-2010)	45% of resolution sessions will result in settlement agreements
2010 (2010-2011)	58% of resolution sessions will result in settlement agreements
2011 (2011-2012)	58% of resolution sessions will result in settlement agreements
2012 (2012-2013)	58% of resolution sessions will result in settlement agreements

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
Review data on resolutions sessions to monitor rates of agreement		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	DPO

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Measurement:

Percent = (mediation agreements for mediations related to due process + mediation agreements for mediations NOT related to due process) divided by # mediations completed times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

For reporting purposes, the Due Process Office (DPO) enters into its Due Process Office database (DOCKET), a mediation docket sheet for each complaint investigation, hearing and expedited hearing request received, even if the initiating party indicates an unwillingness to participate in mediation. For at least eight years, the DPO has offered stand-alone mediations to families and LEAs. Mediations are tracked in detail using DOCKET. The database includes the report issued date and resolution dates for all mediations.

The DPO provided training to mediators on March 18, 2005.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): (July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005)

Table 19.1: Data on Mediation Requests (from Attachment 1)

SECTION B: Mediation requests	
(2) Mediation requests total	248
(2.1) Mediations	
(a) Mediations related to due process	34
(i) Mediation agreements	18
(b) Mediations not related to due process	57
(i) Mediation agreements	42
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	157

Percent = 66% [(18+42)/(34+57)]

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Docket data for the past several years have been collected on a calendar year basis and reported on that basis in Attachment 1 in Maine's Annual Performance Report (APR). The data in the chart below are the values reported in Attachment 1 each year since 2001. Beginning in 2006, Table 7 replaced Attachment 1 as the reporting mechanism for dispute resolutions data.

Table 19.2: Data on Mediation Outcomes

Year	Declined	DPO Decision	Mediated	Partially Mediated	Unsuccessful	Withdrawn	Total	% of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements =(MED+part MED)/(tot-withdrawn-DPO-declined)
2001	64	0	63	3	29	32	191	69%
2002	65	4	81	7	21	28	206	81%
2003	55	7	74	0	20	17	173	79%
2004	85	6	41	1	13	27	173	76%

Measurable and rigorous targets are based on the measurement calculation required by the indicator. OSEP indicated that States should look for an increase in target rates but probably not 100% (they suggest that we look at the APR Attachments 1; see the DOCKET data above). The goal here is to encourage resolution of issues as early as possible so schools and families can focus on teaching and learning. During the past 4 years, data show about 70-80% of mediations result in agreements.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	**76%** of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.
2006 (2006-2007)	**77%** of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.
2007 (2007-2008)	**78%** of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.
2008 (2008-2009)	**80%** of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.
2009 (2009-2010)	**82%** of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.
2010 (2010-2011)	**85%** of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.
2011 (2011-2012)	**85%** of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.
2012 (2012-2013)	**85%** of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
With the advent of the resolution session for hearings initiated by parents, the DPO mediation process has been put in a deferential position vis-à-vis the resolution session timeframe. If both parties agree to participate in mediation within the timelines of a hearing requested by a family, the DPO sets up the mediation to occur on or after the 21st day from the receipt of the request for hearing. As in resolution sessions, mediations are a voluntary process and there's very little that the DPO can do, other than contact the initiating party about the benefits of participation in mediation to ensure that parties participate in mediation. Keeping this in mind, it is difficult to set a percentage goal for mediation agreements when so much of the process is out of the control of the SEA.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	DPO
Review of the indicator by the stakeholder group highlighted the opportunity to improve mediation outcomes by establishing standards for advocates. Additional evaluation will be done of advocate relationships to mediation outcomes to determine the most effective strategies for defining standards.		X	X						

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are:
a. Submitted on or before due dates ; and
b. Accurate

Percent determined using the Data Scoring Rubric (included below)

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Maine Department of Education is required to report annually to the US Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on elements of special education data. Data for these reports are taken from the annual student count done at each LEA in December and subsequent data analysis completed within the Maine Department of Education.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Table 20.1: Data Submission Dates 2004-2005

Data requirement	Content	Due Data	Actual Date
Table 2	Personnel	November 1, 2004	October 29, 2004
Table 4	Exiting	November 1, 2004	October 29, 2004
Table 5	Discipline	November 1, 2004	October 29, 2004
Table 1	Child Count	February 1, 2005	January 28, 2005
Table 3	Educational Environments	February 1, 2005	January 28, 2005
Table 6	Assessment	February 1, 2005	January 28, 2005
Table 7	Dispute Resolution	November 1, 2006	October 30, 2007
Part B APR	Annual Performance Report	April 1, 2005 deferred by letter to May 4, 2005	May 4, 2005

Data Scoring Rubric:

Maine has chosen to use the Rubric for Part B - Indicator 20 to compute the measurement for the indicator. This rubric is a worksheet to assist in compiling data for Indicator 20. An example of the data input worksheet is shown below. The structure is a simple spreadsheet application that accepts data and

calculates a percentage of “Timely and Accurate” data submissions weighted as described in the instructions and tables below.

Instructions: In each cell, select 1 if the requirements were met for the given APR indicator or 618 data collection, 0 if the requirements were not met, and "N/A" if the requirement is not applicable. Note that any cell marked as N/A will decrease the denominator by 1 for APR and 2 for 618.

Definitions of terms used in this worksheet:

SPP/APR Data:

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).
2) Correct Calculation - Result produced follows the required calculation in the instructions for the indicator.
3) Instructions Followed - APR provides information required in the instructions for the indicator.

SPP/APR Data - Indicator 20				
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Correct Calculation	Followed Instructions	Total
1	0		1	1
2	0		1	1
3A	0	1	0	1
3B	1	1	1	3
3C	1	1	1	3
4A	1	1	1	3
5	1	1	1	3
7	0	1	1	2
8	1	0	0	1
9	1	1	1	3
10	1	1	1	3
11	1	1	0	2
12	0	1	0	1
13	1	1	1	3
14	1	1	1	3
15	0	0	0	0
16	1	1	1	3
17	1	1	1	3
18	1	1	1	3
19	1	1	1	3
			Subtotal	45
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) =		50

618 Data:

1) Timely – All data for the APR are submitted on or before February 1, 2008. Data for tables for 618 are submitted on or before each tables' due date. NO extensions.
2) Complete Data – No missing sections. No placeholder data. Data submitted from all districts or agencies.
3) Passed Edit Check - 618 data submissions do not have missing cells or internal inconsistencies.
4) Responded to Data Note Requested - Provided written explanation of year to year changes for inclusion in Data Notes to accompany 618 data submissions.

618 Data - Indicator 20					
Table	**Timely**	**Complete Data**	**Passed Edit Check**	**Responded to Data Note Requests**	**Total**
Table 1 - Child Count Due Date: 2/1/07	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 - Personnel Due Date: 11/1/07	1	1	1	1	4
Table 3 - Ed. Environments Due Date: 2/1/07	1	1	1	1	4
Table 4 - Exiting Due Date: 11/1/07	1	1	1	1	4
Table 5 - Discipline Due Date: 11/1/07	1	1	1	1	4
Table 6 - State Assessment Due Date: 2/1/07	1	1	1	1	4
Table 7 - Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/07	1	1	1	1	4
				Subtotal	27
618 Score Calculation			**Grand Total** (Subtotal X 2) =		54

Calculation of Indicator 20:

Data are summarized in the table below (a continuation of the spreadsheet application) by summing values form above and producing a percentage based on the weighted values. In order to develop an example based upon data, these entries reflect the scoring that represents FFY2005 data reflecting the quality of the submission of the Annual Performance Report (APR) of February 1, 2007. At the time of submission, Maine believed its data to be both timely and accurate, OSEP's June 15, 2007 response letter provided specific feedback regarding data validity and reliability, correct calculations, and following

instructions that were used to population the scoring rubric. The FFY2006 indicators for 1, 2, 3A, 7, 12, and 15 presented in this APR specifically address the data validity and reliability issues that were present in the FFY2005 data submission. The SPP/APR Data - Indicator 20 table entries reflect the scoring that results from the nature of the issues discovered by OSEP during their review of the state's submission. Maine submitted its complete and accurate 618 data on time, and responded promptly to the data note requests for all tables with one exception.

Indicator #20 Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	50
B. 618 Grand Total	56
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	106
Total N/A in APR	0
Total N/A in 618	0
Base	**119**
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*) =	0.891
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	89.1

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Submitting data on time has been a priority for the Data Management/Finance and Federal Programs/Research and Evaluation team in the Office of Special Services. Reports are submitted on time. The annual performance report for the 2003-2004 school year was delayed to address a March 4, 2005 letter (page 22 - "within 60 days of this letter") from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in order to provide adequate response to specific inquiry posed and non-compliance indicated in the letter. The deferred date was May 4, 2005. Subsequently, Maine has continued to provide required data on-time and accurate on each required submission date.

Data accuracy is assured through a feedback verification methodology. Data submitted are verified by the submitting LEA. The Maine Department of Education (MDOE) sends a report of the data submitted by each LEA back to the submitting LEA for review and verification. The LEA is required to validate the data against their records, correct any errors, then sign and return the data report to the MDOE. The 2004-2005 school year data were transferred to the Maine Education Data Management System (MEDMS). Data verification was done on the data transfer that is repeated at every data entry interval. MEDMS employs a set of data verification rules that screen data inputs for consistent/adherent formats, duplicate entries, and omitted fields. The rules assure that data exist in required fields, that no student is inadvertently duplicated in the data, and that the data are comparable across the database. The data provided by the review of FFY2005 submission response and applying those data to the Data Scoring Rubric spreadsheet applications results in 89.1% compliance. Maine continues it implementation of improvement activities that ensure data are submitted on time and accurate in every required submission.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	**100% of data submitted will be on time and accurate.**
2006 (2006-2007)	**100% of data submitted will be on time and accurate.**
2007 (2007-2008)	**100% of data submitted will be on time and accurate.**

2008 (2008-2009)	**100% of data submitted will be on time and accurate.**
2009 (2009-2010)	**100% of data submitted will be on time and accurate.**
2010 (2010-2011)	**100% of data submitted will be on time and accurate.**
2011 (2011-2012)	**100% of data submitted will be on time and accurate.**
2012 (2012-2013)	**100% of data submitted will be on time and accurate.**

Improvement Activities	Timelines								Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur								
	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	
Maine will continue to track required report deadlines and ensure completion on time.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	MDOE
Child count data are being provided in-part using an electronic upload to the OSEP EDEN database.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	MDOE
Additional data elements and other improvement will continue as they are defined.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	MDOE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

TABLE 7

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

Submitted: November 1, 2007, revised: January 2008

OMB NO.: 1820-0677

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

STATE: Maine

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

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

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

SECTION D: Expedited hearing requests (related to disciplinary decision)	
(4) Expedited hearing requests total	6
(4.1) Resolution sessions	0
(a) Settlement agreements	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated)	0
(a) Change of placement ordered	0

Appendix

Part B 619 Parent Survey - children between ages 3 and 5

Part B School Age Parent Survey - children 5 or older

Analysis on Means Description

Analysis of Post High School Outcomes Survey

Part B 619 Parent Survey - children between ages 3 and 5

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

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

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

	Never	Rarely	Often	Always
1. I was offered the help I needed so I could participate in Early Childhood Team (ECT) meetings and in the development of the Individualized Family Service Program(IFSP).				
2. My concerns and recommendations were considered in the development of the IFSP.				
3. I have been asked for my opinion about how well early intervention services are meeting my child's needs.				
4. Any written information I receive is written or explained to me in a way I understand.				
5. CDS staff treat me as a team member.				
6. Those involved in my child's ECT meetings seek out my input.				
7. I received a copy of my rights and was told who to call if I didn't understand something.				
8. I know who to call with questions regarding my child's early intervention.				
9. The CDS site communicates with me regarding my child's progress on IFSP goals.				
10. The CDS site offers me training about early intervention issues.				
11. The CDS site helps me to play an active role in my child's early intervention.				
12. The CDS site explains what options I have if I disagree with a decision.				
13. I feel welcome by administration and staff from the CDS site.				
14. CDS staff have helped me get the services that my child needs.				
15. CDS staff have helped me communicate more effectively with the people who work with my child. 16. CDS staff have helped me know about my child's and my rights concerning special education services.				
17. My input regarding the transition needs that focus on my child's transition-to-school goals are considered in the development of the IEP.				
18. The CDS site assists me in understanding what outside agencies can assist my child in realizing his/her education goals.				

19. What your current involvement with Early Intervention Services.
    a. ___ My child has only been referred for services.
    b. ___ My child has been determined eligible for services.
    c. ___ We are currently waiting for services to begin.
    d. ___ We have been receiving services.

20. How old was your child at the time you completed this survey?
    a. __ 3 years old b. __ 4 years old c. __ 5 years old d. __ older than 5

21. What grade is your child in, if any? _____

22. Is your child a male or female?
    a. ___ Male b. ___ Female

23. How old was your child when he or she was first referred to Special Education?
    a. __ Birth - 2 b. __ 3 - 5

24. What is your child's race / ethnicity
    a. __ White b. __ African-American c. __ Hispanic
    d. __ Asian or Pacific Islander e. __ American Indian/Alaskan Native

25. What is your relationship to the child?
    a. __ Mother b. __ Father c. __ Guardian
    d. __ Surrogate Parent e. __ Foster Parent f. __ Grandparent

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

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

Part B School Age Parent Survey - children 5 or older

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

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

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

	Never	Rarely	Often	Always
1. I was offered the help I needed so I could participate in Pupil Evaluation Team (PET) meetings and in the development of my child's Individualized Educational Program (IEP).				
2. My concerns and recommendations are considered in the development of the IEP.				
3. I have been asked for my opinion about how well special education services are meeting my child's needs.				
4. Any information I receive is written or explained to me in a way I understand.				
5. Teachers treat me as a team member.				
6. Those involved in my child's IEP meetings seek out my input.				
7. I received a copy of my rights and was told who to call if I didn't understand something.				
8. I know who to call with questions regarding my child's special education.				
9. The school communicates with me regarding my child's progress on IEP goals.				
10. The school offers me training about special education issues.				
11. The school helps me to play an active role in my child's education.				
12. The school explains what options I have if I disagree with a decision.				
13. I feel welcome by administration and staff from the school.				
14. Special education staff have helped me get the educational services my child needs.				
15. Special education staff have helped me communicate more effectively with the people who work with my child.				
16. Special education staff have helped me know about my child's and my rights concerning special education services.				
17. For my 14 to 20 year old, my input is considered in the development of the IEP that focuses on my child's goals after high school.				
18. For my 14 to 20 year old, the school helps me understand which outside agencies can help my child reach his/her after high school goals.				

19. How old was your child at the time you completed this survey?
    a. __ 5-11 b. __ 12-17 c. __ 18-20

20. Where does your child attend school? _____

21. What grade is your child in? _____

22. Is your child a male or female?
a . _____ Male b. _____ Female

23. How old was your child when he or she was first identified as a student with special education needs?
a. __ Birth - 2 b. __ 3 - 5 c. __ 6 - 11 d. ___ 12 - 17

24. What is your child's race / ethnicity
a. __ White b. __ African-American c. __ Hispanic
d. __ Asian or Pacific Islander e. __ American Indian/Alaskan Native

25. What is your relationship to the child?
a. __ Mother b. __ Father c. __ Guardian
d. __ Surrogate Parent e. __ Foster Parent f. __ Grandparent

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

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

Proportion Analysis

Proportion analysis is method of comparing a collection of means, rates, or proportions to see if any of them are significantly different from the overall mean, rate, or proportion. The proportion analysis establishes upper lower bounds by taking into account the size of the district. Once these upper and lower bounds are calculated, the proportion for the any subject subgroup of the population is then compared to the overall proportion in the state for the subject category. The procedure for proportional analysis is very similar in structure to the E-formula method proposed by the Data Accountability Center for establishing over-representation or under-representation in specific racial/ethnic group for the particular disability, educational environment, or discipline category.

The bounds are mathematically derived using a statistical estimate of standard error ($\sqrt{\frac{pq}{n}}$) as standard deviation for a sub-population, then applying the estimate to define three standard deviation boundaries around the grand mean ($\overline{p}$) for the local population (*n)*.

The decision bounds for binomial proportion analysis are calculated using the following formulas:

Upper Determination Bound: $\overline{p} + \left(3 \times \sqrt{\frac{p \times (1-p)}{n}} \right)$

Lower Determination Bound: $\overline{p} - \left(3 \times \sqrt{\frac{p \times (1-p)}{n}} \right)$

where:
$\overline{p}$ = average of the proportions (grand mean)

p = local proportion (mean)
n = sample size (local subgroup population)

Graphically, proportion analysis presents confidence intervals that are population sensitive. Note how the confidence band decreases as the size of the population increases. This is because we can be more confident in the obtained results of a large sample than a small one.



Proportion analysis is used in two ways to analyze the district data in Maine. First is a comparison of district data to state data as in the assessment of graduation rates, dropout rates, educational placements and similar percentages that can be compared statewide without significant concern about local population characteristic bias. It can be realistically presumed that districts across the state should be graduating students at a relatively consistent rate, independent of local population considerations. A similar statement would apply to other measures that are unlikely to exhibit significant variations due to local population factors.

Statewide Measures

As a matter of practice, LEA performance is evaluated against state averages using analysis of means. The measurements for graduation rates, dropout rates, suspension and expulsion rates, regular classroom placement, resource room placement, out of district placement and parent survey involvement percentages are evaluated in this fashion to detect LEAs with significant differences from state averages in any one these measures. The proportion analysis method identifies opportunities in specific areas of performance that are used to focus LEA improvement activities on relative weaknesses with respect to performance in those measures statewide. The results of these analyses are used as an integral part of Maine's LEA determination process to motivate improvements in specifically identified performance measures exhibiting deficiencies in each LEA.

Local Measures

Other measures are locally disparate from state averages, and require proportion analyses that assess subgroup performance to the LEA averages. Such a measure is disproportionality. Maine has relatively small non-Caucasian populations that are clustered in communities within the state, causing significantly variant proportions of non-Caucasian form LEA to LEA in the state. Comparison of local populations to state populations is inappropriate. However, it is quite appropriate to evaluate the identifications rates of students in ethnic group in special education to the ethnic proportions of the population within the LEA. The LEA population is reflective of the community population and can be compared locally. An example

of ANOM as applies to ethnic representation in special education for one of Maine's largest LEAs is shown below. Note that fewer than ten American Indian students are identified as special education

	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic	Caucasian	Grand Total
Selected LEA Total Population	34	66	628	94	3745	4567
Selected LEA Special Education Population			97	17	735	857
LEA proportion	0.7%	1.4%	13.8%	2.1%	82.0%	
LEA Special Education Population			11.3%	2.0%	85.8%	
Upper Determination Bound			23.4%	12.2%	85.9%	
Lower Determination Bound			4.1%	0.0%	78.1%	



Note that fewer than ten American Indian students or Asian students are identified as special education in the LEA, so their data are suppressed. Populations of fewer that ten are not evaluated to determine disproportionate representation.

The data are graphed on two separate numeric scales because the relative differences and bounds for non-Caucasians are indistinguishable when viewed in comparison to Caucasians. The upper bound is the highest percentage of special education students of the particular ethnicity that would still be considered to be similar to the overall LEA percentage of the ethnic group. If the special education percentage exceeded the general population percentage by more than the percentage shown as the upper bound, then that representation would be considered to be disproportionately over-represented. Similarly, special education percentages below the lower bound would be considered disproportionately under-represented. Either condition would flag the LEA for audit of their policies, procedures and practices associated with identification.

The same technique is applied to disability subgroups by ethnicity. The Speech Language subgroup from the same LEA was selected for demonstration in the chart below. Again, data are suppressed for population values below ten.

Speech Language Impairment by LEA and Ethnicity

	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic	Caucasian	Grand Total
Selected LEA Total Population	34	66	628	94	3745	4567
Selected LEA Special Education Population			13		113	133
LEA proportion	0.7%	1.4%	13.8%	2.1%	82.0%	
LEA Special Education Population			9.8%		85.0%	
Upper Bound			38.5%		92.1%	
Lower Bound			0.0%		71.9%	

The upper and lower bounds bracket the range of percentage values that would be considered to be similar to the overall percentages in the general population. Percentages outside those limits would be considered to be disproportionately represented and would flag the LEA for audit of their policies, procedures and practices associated with identification in specific disability categories.

IDEA

Targeted Needs

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

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

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

November 2006

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

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

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

Table of Contents

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

Table 19. Since leaving high school, have you had additional training or coursework?	9
Job Status	9
Table 20. Respondent Reasons for Unemployment	10
Table 21. Which of these occupations comes closest to what you are currently doing for work?	10
Table 22. Salary	11
Table 23. Do you receive any benefits with this job?	11
Dreaming of a Better Life	11
Table 24. What is the main thing you would add or change that would make your work life better?	11
Table 25. What is the main thing you would add or change that would make your life better?	12
V. Limitations	12
VI. Summary	12
How Do Respondents Compare to the Target Population?	12
Characteristics of the Surveyed Population	12
The Survey	13
Appendix A. Survey Responses Based on Respondent Means of Program Exit	14
Appendix B. Survey Responses Based on Respondent Disability	16
Appendix C. Survey Responses Based on Special Education Placement	18

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

U.S. Office of Special Education Programs
November 2006

I. Introduction

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

In 2005, 2,097 students exited high school special education programs throughout the state of Maine. Approximately one year later, each of these students was mailed a postcard requesting that he or she either login to complete a survey online or call the number provided and answer the questions over the phone. With only 11% (n = 228) of the postcards returned as undeliverable, it can be assumed that nearly 90% (n = 1,869) of all postcards reached homes of the graduates. A second mailing was conducted for students who had not responded to the first postcard or for who no phone number listed. Of these slightly more than 500 postcards sent, 4% (n = 20) were returned as undeliverable. Students who did not complete the online version of the survey were contacted via telephone and asked to participate by completing the survey over the phone. By all attempted contacts, only 85 graduates were not reached by one effort or another.

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

II. How Do Respondents Compare to the Target Population?

An analysis of target population and respondents reveals that the two groups are substantially similar in their distribution by school administrative unit (SAU). This was determined by comparing the statewide distribution of high school special education participants who completed their education in May of 2005 (N = 2,097) with the distribution of participants who completed the survey (N = 497). When the variables means of program exit, special education placement, and disability were examined for each of the two groups, it only further strengthened the notion that these two populations are adequately similar. Therefore, it would be both appropriate and statistically justified to make assumptions about the entire target population based upon the information provided by the respondents here. (See Tables 1-3.)

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

	Respondents	Target Population
Graduated with Diploma	77%	71%
Dropped Out	16%	24%

Graduated through Certificate/Fulfillment of I.E.P. Requirement	6%	4%
Reached Maximum Age	1%	1%
Total	*N* = 497	*N* = 2,097

Table 2. Population Comparison: Respondent Special Education Placement

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

Table 3. Population Comparison: Respondent Reported Disability

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

[a]Target population also included "orthopedic impairment," which represented < .05% of the total population.

III. Characteristics of the Surveyed Population

Means of Program Exit

Approximately three quarters (77%) of all respondents reported that they had graduated from their high school with a diploma. Another 6% stated they had graduated by obtaining a certificate or by fulfilling an I.E.P. requirement. Five students (1%) completed their program by

reaching the maximum age limit and nearly one fifth (16%) had reportedly dropped out of school before completing their program. Students whose status was unknown—had exited high school through regular education, moved out of district but were known to be continuing their education, were still receiving special education services, or were deceased—were not surveyed. (See Table 4 for complete results regarding respondent means of program exit.)

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

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

Program Placement

Slightly more than half of all respondents (52%) reported having been placed in regular high school classrooms. With one quarter of respondents (24%) indicating that they had been placed in a resource room, that leaves less than a quarter for self- contained, private/public separate day school, and homebound or hospitalized placements. (See Table 5 for complete results regarding special education placement.)

Table 5. Respondent Special Education Placement

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

Over three quarters of all respondents who were placed in a regular classroom (83%) or resource room (81%) graduated with a diploma. The same was true for over half of respondents placed in a self-contained classroom (58%). However, these percentages dropped for those attending either public or private separate day schools, with less than half of these respondents (44%) graduating with a diploma and nearly a quarter dropping out all together. Over half of all respondents who were either homebound or hospitalized during their high school education (60%) reported dropping out. (See Table 6 for a look at means of program exit based on program placement.)

Table 6. Means of Exit Based on Placement

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

Disability

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

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

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

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

Table 7. Respondent Reported Disability

	n	%
Learning Disability	207	42%
Other Health Impairment	75	15%
Multihandicapped	72	14%
Emotional Disability	57	11%
Speech and Language Impairment	35	7%
Mental Retardation	24	5%
Autism	15	3%
Traumatic Brain Injury	5	1%
Hearing Impairment	4	1%

Visual Impairment	2	<.05%
Deaf	1	<.05%
Total	*N* = 497	100%

Table 8. Respondent Means of Exit Based on Respondent Disability

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

Table 9. Respondent Means of Exit Based on Placement

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

Deaf	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%

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

IV. The Survey

IEP Procedures

Most students (68%) indicated that they were active participants when it came to transition planning. Although only about one eighth of all students (12%) stated that they lead or facilitated their IEP meeting, most (83%) felt that their own preferences and interests were taken into consideration during the resulting discussions. (See Tables 10-12 for complete results pertaining to IEP sessions.)

Table 10. Did you actively participate in transition planning?

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

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

	n	%
No	421	85%
Yes	58	12%
No response	18	4%
Total	*N* = 497	100%

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

	n	%
Yes	414	83%
No	69	14%
No response	14	3%
Total	*N* = 497	100%

Effectiveness of Classwork

Respondents were split fairly evenly between those who attended career vocational technical schools (47%) and those who did not (51%). When asked to choose the one high school or technical school class or program of extracurricular activity from each of several different categories which was most helpful in

preparing themselves to find a job and to work, participant responses were as follows:

- Mainstream Academics: Mathematics (*n* = 14), English (*n* = 8), Science (*n* = 6), Social Studies (*n* = 3).

- Mainstream Other: Industrial Arts (*n* = 21), Computer Education (*n* = 10), Art (*n* = 5), Driver Education and Drafting/Mechanical Drawing (*n* = 2 each), Business Education, Living Arts, Physical Education, Peer Support Programs (*n* = 1 each).
- Special Education: Resource Room/Consulting Teacher Program (*n* = 5), Special Class Academics and Community Based Living Skills (*n* = 2 each), Speech/Language Therapy (*n* = 1).

- Regular Vocational/Technical Education Programs: Building Trades (*n* = 13), Auto Mechanics/Auto-Body Repair (*n* = 12), Computer Programming/Operations (*n* = 5), Drafting/Graphic Arts, Electronics, and Culinary Arts/Food Service Occupations (*n* = 2 each), Farming/Agriculture/Horticulture/Forestry, Commercial Arts, Machine Trades, Health Care Occupations, Home Economics/Dietetics/Child Care/Human Services (*n* = 1 each).

- Social Vocational Education Programs: Vocational Special Needs Resource Teacher Programs (*n* = 3), Community-Based On-the-Job Training and Career Center (*n* = 2 each), Jobs for Maine Graduates and Special Class Industrial Arts (*n* = 1 each).

- Extracurricular Activities: Other (*n* = 22)*, Athletics (*n* = 4), Vocational Clubs (*n* = 3), Student Newspaper/Yearbook (*n* = 2), Dramatics and Student Government (*n* = 1 each). *Other includes: welding, automotive, cdl class, computers, construction, cooking, creative writing, football, Hancock Tech, human relations, life skills, Maine Corp, math, orientation leader, plumbing and heating, and vocational classes.

- Ninety-four students (19%) reported that they did not find any classes or programs to be helpful.

Other Activities During Academic Year

Approximately half of all respondents (44%) stated that they did participate in extracurricular activities while in high school. Similarly, about half (49%) also held a paying job while in high school. Forty-two percent (42%) of those holding a paying job during high school worked anywhere from 16 to 20 hours a week. Of the 242 respondents reporting that they held a paying job while attending high school, over half (60%, *n* = 130) also indicated that they participated in extracurricular activities. (See Tables 13-15 for complete results.)

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

	n	%
No	245	49%
Yes	217	44%
No response	35	7%
Total	*N* = 497	100%

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

	n	%
Yes	242	49%
No	239	48%
No response	16	3%
Total	*N* = 497	100%

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

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

Plans to Reality

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

Thirty-nine percent of all respondents (*n* = 195) are currently in school. Most of these students (72%) are enrolled in either a two- or four-year college. Of those attending a technical college (*n* = 76, 15% of all respondents), nearly all (86%) did not enter through an articulation agreement. Approximately half of all respondents (44%) stated that they have not participated in any training or coursework since leaving high school. Fifteen respondents (3%) had indeed enlisted in the military by the time of this survey. (See Tables 17-19.)

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

	n	%
Attend a two-year college	119	24%
Attend a four-year college	100	20%
Not sure at this time	76	15%
Attend a vocational/technical program	75	15%
Work full time	64	13%
Other education program[a]	19	4%

Work part-time	14	3%
Enlist in the military	13	3%
Be a homemaker	4	1%
No response	13	3%
Total	*N* = 497	100%

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

Table 17. Are you in school now?

	n	%
No	289	58%
Yes	195	39%
No response	13	3%
Total	*N* = 497	100%

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

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

[a]Three-year associates, AMAC, correspondence courses, day program, home schooling, Job Corp, living, Maine Maritime Academy, military school, MMI, secondary school for adolescents with learning differences, Sylvan Learning Center, TUDOR
[b]This question was only asked of those respondents who indicated that they are now in school (see Table 17). Total is two less than expected due to two respondents indicating "none."

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

	n	%[a]
Have not participated in any training or coursework	218	44%
Vocational/Technical Education	53	11%
College or University Courses (non-degree)	105	21%
GED	13	3%
Adult Basic Education (ABE) (credit or non-credit)	14	3%
Military	7	1%

Job Corps	10	2%
Supported Employment	10	2%
On-the-Job Training Provided by Employer or Outside Agency	30	6%
Other	34	7%

[a]Percentage is of the total number of survey respondents (*N* = 497).

Job Status

Slightly more than half of all respondents (56%, *n* = 276) reported that they currently have a paying job. Retail sales, restaurant work, and construction trades accounted for nearly 30% of these respondents. Three quarters (76%) of all employed in a paying job are receiving compensation that is above the minimum wage (> $6.50/hour). Seventy-one percent are not receiving benefits as part of their compensation.

Of those who do not currently hold a paying job, about a third (30%) are currently seeking employment and/or are coming across barriers to employment. Nearly one tenth (9%) of unemployed participants are currently participating in some form of job training. (See Tables 20- 23).

Table 20. Respondent Reasons for Unemployment

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

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

	n	%
Retail sales	29	11%
Restaurant Work/Good Service (waiter, dishwasher, etc.)	24	9%
Construction Trades (carpentry, masonry, plumbing, etc.)	21	8%
Human Services/Work with People/Children	6	2%
Janitorial/Housekeeping/Maintenance/Groundskeeping	6	2%
Military Service	6	2%
Auto Mechanics/Auto Body Repair	5	2%
Materials Handler/Loader/Teamster/Warehouse Worker	5	2%

Computer Programming/Operations	5	2%
Secretarial/Stenographic/Typing or Other Office Work	5	2%
Hotel/Tourism	4	1%
Machine Trades	4	1%
Assembly (factory work)	3	1%
Stock Clerk/Stock Boy or Girl	3	1%
Cosmetology/Hairdressing/Barbering	2	1%
Gas Station Attendant	2	1%
Marine Trades (ship/boat building, etc)	2	1%
Fishing/Lobstering	2	1%
Artistic (painting, dramatics, music, entertainment)	2	1%
Electronics	1	< .05%
Farm Work/Working with Animals	1	< .05%
Total[a]	276	100%

[a]A total of 276 respondents indicated that they currently have a paying job.

Table 22. Salary

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

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

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

	n	%
No	196	71%
Yes	58	21%
Don't Know	13	5%
No response	9	3%
Total*(a)*	276	100%

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

Dreaming of a Better Life

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

V. Limitations

A total of 626 students (30% of the total approached) were successfully contacted. Of these 626 students, nearly 500 completed the survey (*N* = 497, 24% of total approached).

Fifty eight (12%) of these surveys were completed online. The remaining 433 (88%) were conducted over the telephone. One fifth (*n* = 128) of the students successfully contacted refused to complete the survey. An additional 9 students (1%) only partially completed the survey.

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

VI. Summary

How Do Respondents Compare to the Total Target Population?

After carefully comparing the target population of nearly 2,100 high school students who had both participated in special education and were scheduled to graduate in May of 2005 with the surveyed population consisting of nearly 500 of these students, it appears that their similarities are such that it is appropriate to make assumptions about the entire target population based upon the information provided by the respondents. Variables compared between the two populations were means of exiting high school special education program, special education placement, and participant disability.

Characteristics of the Surveyed Population

Approximately three quarters of all respondents completed their high school programs with a diploma, with an additional 6% graduating through a certificate program or fulfillment of an I.E.P. requirement. When looking at graduation rates based on special education placement, students placed in a regular classrooms or resource rooms were significantly more likely to graduate with a diploma than those in other types of placement. Homebound or hospitalized students were less likely to graduate with a diploma and were more likely to drop out than those in other placement situations.

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

The Survey

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

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix A
Survey Responses Based On Respondent Means of Program Exit

Table A1. Did you actively participate in transition planning?

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

Note: Some subjects provided multiple responses.

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

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

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

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

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

	Graduated with Diploma		Dropped Out		Graduated through Certificate/Fulfill-ment of I.E.P. Requirement		Reached Maximum Age		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
No	172	45%	55	67%	15	54%	3	60%	245	49%
Yes	183	48%	21	26%	13	46%	0	0%	217	44%

No response	27	7%	6	7%	0	0%	2	40%	35	7%
Total	382	100%	82	100%	28	100%	5	100%	497	100%

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

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

Table A6. Are you in school now?

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

Appendix B
Survey Responses Based On Respondent Disability

Table B1. Did you actively participate in transition planning?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Total	242	49%	239	48%	16	3%	497	100%

Table B6. Are you in school now?

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

Appendix C
Survey Responses Based On Special Education Placement

Table C1. Did you actively participate in transition planning?

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

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

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

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

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

Total	414	83%	69	14%	14	3%	497	100%

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

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

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

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

Table C6. Are you in school now?

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