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# Introduction

**Instructions**

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State’s systems designed to drive improved results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and to ensure that the Lead Agency (LA) meets the requirements of Part C of the IDEA. This introduction must include descriptions of the State’s General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

Child Development Services (CDS) is a quasi-governmental agency responsible for the implementation of Part C and Part B 619. As described in the state stature: The Maine Department of Education (MDOE)Commissioner “shall establish and supervise the state intermediate educational unit. The state intermediate educational unit is established as a body corporate and politic and as a public instrumentality of the State for the purpose of conducting child find activities as provided in 20 United States Code, Section 1412 (a)(3) for children from birth to under 6 years of age, ensuring the provision of early intervention services for eligible children from birth to under 3 years of age and ensuring a free, appropriate public education for eligible children at least 3 years of age and under 6 years of age.” MRSA 20-A§7209(3)  
  
CDS, an intermediate educational unit (IEU), has nine regional locations that serve as system points of entry for Part C and 619 and one state office. The state CDS office maintains a central data management system, system-wide policies and procedures, system-wide contracts for service providers, and centralized fiscal services.

**General Supervision System**

**The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.**

CDS implements the General Supervision System for Part C and Part B 619 in Maine that was developed in conjunction with MDOE. Monitoring, findings, corrections and implementation of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and Maine Unified Special Education Regulation (MUSER) are the primary responsibilities for the CDS Data Manager, under the direction of the Part C State Coordinator/State Director of the State Intermediate Educational Unit (IEU)  
  
All Sites are monitored, provided letter of findings, required to submit corrective action plans and are provided determinations annually. The Commissioner of Education provides certification of the information by submitting the letters of findings. CDS State IEU has adopted the Part B due process procedures and utilizes the MDOE Due Process office to fulfill the requirements of IDEA.

**Technical Assistance System:**

**The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.**

The CDS State Director continues to serve as both the Early Intervention Technical Adviser and the Part C Coordinator. In this dual role, the CDS State Director provides assistance to any and all early intervention providers in Maine, as needed or as determined, to ensure compliance with federal Part C indicators and progress toward targets. This position is also responsible for ensuring the Routines-Based Early Intervention (RBEI) model and other scientifically-based practices are implemented with fidelity.  
  
The CDS State Director, in collaboration with Regional Early Intervention Program Managers, continually reviews State Part C data and revises procedures and policies as needed to ensure compliance with and movement toward federal Part C indicators and fidelity to the RBEI model and other scientifically-based practices. This continuous improvement approach results in ongoing data review and timely guidance to the field.  
  
The CDS State Director also works closely with the State 619 Coordinator, the State Data Manager, and Regional Early Intervention Program Managers to ensure that there is an understanding of roles and responsibilities in each program as related to transition and to develop materials to support smooth transition of children who are turning three. The CDS State Director and other State Leadership representatives and site-level leadership representatives also represent CDS on a number of state and local committees as well as state and local multiagency collaboratives.  
  
CDS requested technical assistance in the areas of fiscal, eligibility, timelines, C to B transition, General Supervision System, APR, SSIP, the extended Part C Option, and data analysis from the IDEA Data Center (IDC), the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA Center), the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy), Infant and Toddler Coordinators Association (ITCA).

**Professional Development System:**

**The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.**

In FFY2018, CDS continued its efforts, initially addressed through its State Personnel Development Grant, “to increase the percentages of children, ages birth-two, receiving timely, evidence-based early intervention services in their natural environments by qualified personnel”. These efforts include the initial training of new staff and contracted providers on all components of RBEI, including family ecology, child and family needs assessment, participation-based outcomes, support-based home visits, and collaborative consultation to childcare. All staff and contracted providers receive ongoing fidelity checks on the above components and subsequent focused trainings are developed based on the results of those fidelity checks.  
  
Regional sites have also conducted professional development needs assessments and accessed trainings based on the results of those assessments. These topics include neonatal abstinence syndrome, trauma-informed practices, cultural competency, regional resources/partners, outreach to potential referral sources, and the Part B and 619 Child Find process.  
  
CDS State Leadership was also involved in a number of new and continuing state initiatives for the purposes of collaboration, pooling of resources, and the reduction of silos. These include: The Developmental Systems Integration (DSI) project (a sub-group of Maine Quality Counts), the goal of which is to increase the statewide rate of developmental screenings, to ensure the sharing of those results with appropriate agencies, and to support referrals of families to relevant resources. DSI has also developed a cross-sector Care Coordinator training to ensure that all care coordinators have a foundational knowledge of care coordination best practices and awareness of available resources; The Maine Education Center for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (MECDHH) Community of Practice which focuses on refining the process of fully integrating professionals with expertise in working with deaf and hard of hearing infants, toddlers and their families into CDS’ implementation of RBEI; The Maine Children’s Cabinet, a newly-formed cohort of leadership from across State agencies and departments established for the purpose of coordinating state resources and efforts to achieve optimal outcomes for Maine children.  
  
The CDS State IEU utilizes the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) to solicit stakeholder input on the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR). In addition, the SICC also discusses Part C trends and identifies priorities for Maine’s Part C program. The SICC currently meets quarterly, however a recent infusion of new members has resulted in its reinvigoration and more frequent meetings are likely.  
  
CDS also works closely with regional site leadership and staff, contracted providers, and other State entities such as the Maine Education Center for Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Maine Families Home Visiting, Maine Center for Disease Control’s Children with Special Healthcare Needs, Child Welfare, Early Head Start, and the Office of MaineCare (Medicaid) Services. These collaborations allow for the pooling of resources and increase stakeholder engagement with the Part C Programs. As a result, those stakeholders impact, both directly and indirectly, Maine’s performance on federal indicators.

**Stakeholder Involvement:**

**The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP/APR, and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 11, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

The CDS State IEU utilizes the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State Performance Plan (SPP) and annual Performance Report (APR) including revisions and setting targets. In addition, the SICC also discusses Part C trends and identifies priorities for Maine’s Part C program. The SICC currently meets quarterly, however a recent infusion of new members has resulted in its reinvigoration and more frequent meetings are likely.  
  
CDS also works closely with regional site leadership and staff, contracted providers, and other State entities such as the Maine Education Center for Deaf/Hard of Hearing, the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research, Maine Families Home Visiting, Maine Center for Disease Control’s Children with Special Healthcare Needs, Child Welfare, and Early Head Start. These collaborations allow for the pooling of resources and increase stakeholder engagement with the Part C Programs. As a result, those stakeholders impact, both directly and indirectly, Maine’s performance on federal indicators.  
  
CDS is also involved in a number of initiatives in Maine where information is gathered from and shared in relation to Early Intervention Services and the success and challenges the State faces for infants and toddlers. Like the SICC these initiatives have cross sector representation.

**Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part C results indicators (y/n)**

YES

**Reporting to the Public:**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2017 performance of each EIS Program located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State’s SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.**

Reports to the public on the performance of the regional sites (EIS programs) are available on the CDS website at https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/cds, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A). In addition to the SPP/APR, CDS’ “Reporting” webpage also includes CDS’ Letters of Determination, State Systemic Improvement Plan, and Annual Legislative Report.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## Intro - OSEP Response

The State has not publicly reported on the FFY 2017 performance of each EIS program or provider located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA.  
   
OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2017 SPP/APR required the State to include in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR a Web link demonstrating that the State has fully reported to the public on the performance of each early intervention service program or provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR for FFY 2016. The State did not publicly report on the FFY 2016 performance of each EIS program or provider located in the State on the targets for Indicator 5 and Indicator 6.   
  
The State did not provide verification that the attachment it included in its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission is in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508 and noted in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR User Guides and technical webinar.   
  
The State did not, as required by the measurement table, provide a target for FFY 2019 for Indicator C-11/State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

## Intro - Required Actions

# Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Fanily Service Plans(IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the State’s criteria for “timely” receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

**Measurement**

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

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

**Instructions**

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select early intervention service (EIS) programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

The State’s timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent).

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs’ (OSEP’s) response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | 2005 | 91.00% |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.58% | 99.17% | 99.03% | 93.26% | 93.17% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner** | **Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 742 | 762 | 93.17% | 100% | 97.38% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances**

***This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.***

0

**Include your State’s criteria for “timely” receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).**

Maine's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services is no later than 30 days from the parental consent of initiation of services.

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

State database

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

XXX

**Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).**

Data collected from the full reporting period of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

**Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.**

Data accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period since a full reporting period is used (July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019). The full year data has historically been used to calculate timeliness of services.

**If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2017 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that the 4 regional CDS sites with incidents of noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements specific to the timely provision of services. Specifically, the CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from the State data base (CINC), regional CDS site self-assessments, and compliance reports submitted by each regional site to verify that the 4 regional CDS sites with incidents of noncompliance had achieved 100% compliance in the timely provision of services.

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

The CDS State IEU verified that individual cases of noncompliance which occurred in FFY 2017 had been corrected. All affected infants and toddlers whose services were not provided in a timely manner did receive those services, although the provision of those services was late.

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 1 - OSEP Response

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (*EMAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State’s 618 data reported in Table 2. If not, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | 2005 | 89.00% |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target>= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Data | 99.40% | 99.89% | 98.79% | 98.40% | 99.23% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target>= | 95.00% | 95.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDS State IEU utilizes the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State Performance Plan (SPP) and annual Performance Report (APR) including revisions and setting targets. In addition, the SICC also discusses Part C trends and identifies priorities for Maine’s Part C program. The SICC currently meets quarterly, however a recent infusion of new members has resulted in its reinvigoration and more frequent meetings are likely.  
  
CDS also works closely with regional site leadership and staff, contracted providers, and other State entities such as the Maine Education Center for Deaf/Hard of Hearing, the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research, Maine Families Home Visiting, Maine Center for Disease Control’s Children with Special Healthcare Needs, Child Welfare, and Early Head Start. These collaborations allow for the pooling of resources and increase stakeholder engagement with the Part C Programs. As a result, those stakeholders impact, both directly and indirectly, Maine’s performance on federal indicators.  
  
CDS is also involved in a number of initiatives in Maine where information is gathered from and shared in relation to Early Intervention Services and the success and challenges the State faces for infants and toddlers. Like the SICC these initiatives have cross sector representation.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/10/2019 | Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings | 929 |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/10/2019 | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | 935 |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings** | **Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 929 | 935 | 99.23% | 95.00% | 99.36% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 2 - OSEP Response

The State did not, as required by the measurement table, provide a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

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

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

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

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

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

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

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those infants and toddlers who entered early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:**

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

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

**Instructions**

**Sampling of infants and toddlers with IFSPs** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement, include in the numerator and denominator only infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Report: (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State’s Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements.

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

If the State’s Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or “at-risk infants and toddlers”) under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or “developmentally delayed children”) or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or “children with diagnosed conditions”)). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers).

## 3 - Indicator Data

**Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or “at-risk infants and toddlers”) under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? (yes/no)**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDS State IEU utilizes the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State Performance Plan (SPP) and annual Performance Report (APR) including revisions and setting targets. In addition, the SICC also discusses Part C trends and identifies priorities for Maine’s Part C program. The SICC currently meets quarterly, however a recent infusion of new members has resulted in its reinvigoration and more frequent meetings are likely.  
  
CDS also works closely with regional site leadership and staff, contracted providers, and other State entities such as the Maine Education Center for Deaf/Hard of Hearing, the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research, Maine Families Home Visiting, Maine Center for Disease Control’s Children with Special Healthcare Needs, Child Welfare, and Early Head Start. These collaborations allow for the pooling of resources and increase stakeholder engagement with the Part C Programs. As a result, those stakeholders impact, both directly and indirectly, Maine’s performance on federal indicators.  
  
CDS is also involved in a number of initiatives in Maine where information is gathered from and shared in relation to Early Intervention Services and the success and challenges the State faces for infants and toddlers. Like the SICC these initiatives have cross sector representation.

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| **A1** | 2008 | Target>= | 53.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% |
| **A1** | 51.50% | Data | 44.70% | 55.40% | 59.52% | 64.03% | 64.24% |
| **A2** | 2008 | Target>= | 41.00% | 41.00% | 41.00% | 41.00% | 41.00% |
| **A2** | 39.70% | Data | 54.87% | 60.13% | 44.03% | 41.67% | 39.26% |
| **B1** | 2008 | Target>= | 60.00% | 60.00% | 60.00% | 60.00% | 60.00% |
| **B1** | 59.10% | Data | 54.05% | 67.73% | 71.69% | 73.59% | 67.99% |
| **B2** | 2008 | Target>= | 27.00% | 27.00% | 27.00% | 27.00% | 27.00% |
| **B2** | 25.60% | Data | 33.33% | 35.56% | 27.35% | 29.94% | 31.13% |
| **C1** | 2008 | Target>= | 53.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% |
| **C1** | 51.50% | Data | 61.11% | 67.24% | 67.97% | 68.34% | 70.54% |
| **C2** | 2008 | Target>= | 38.00% | 38.00% | 38.00% | 38.00% | 38.00% |
| **C2** | 37.20% | Data | 58.28% | 63.09% | 45.91% | 41.36% | 39.81% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target A1>= | 54.00% | 54.00% |
| Target A2>= | 42.00% | 42.00% |
| Target B1>= | 61.00% | 61.00% |
| Target B2>= | 28.00% | 28.00% |
| Target C1>= | 54.00% | 54.00% |
| Target C2>= | 39.00% | 39.00% |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed**

745

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

|  | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 1 | 0.13% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 217 | 29.13% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 265 | 35.57% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 143 | 19.19% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 119 | 15.97% |

|  | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. 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 | 408 | 626 | 64.24% | 54.00% | 65.18% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 262 | 745 | 39.26% | 42.00% | 35.17% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable**

Several factors have likely contributed to the slippage in the percent of infants and toddlers who functioning within age expectations with regard to positive social-emotional skills. These include Maine’s more restrictive eligibility criteria (Category C), an increase in the incidence of Autism Spectrum Disorder, and the regional prevalence of socioeconomic factors which significantly impact the health and development of infants, toddlers, and their families. Another factor which likely impacted Maine’s reporting is continued clarification on the accurate scoring of the Child Outcome Summary form.

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

|  | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 3 | 0.40% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 198 | 26.58% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 342 | 45.91% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 153 | 20.54% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 49 | 6.58% |

|  | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. 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 | 495 | 696 | 67.99% | 61.00% | 71.12% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 202 | 745 | 31.13% | 28.00% | 27.11% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable**

Several factors have likely contributed to the slippage in the percent of infants and toddlers who functioning within age expectations with regard to the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills. These include Maine’s more restrictive eligibility criteria (Category C), an increase in the incidence of Autism Spectrum Disorder, and the regional prevalence of socioeconomic factors which significantly impact the health and development of infants, toddlers, and their families. Another factor which likely impacted Maine’s reporting is continued clarification on the accurate scoring of the Child Outcome Summary form.

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

|  | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 2 | 0.27% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 196 | 26.31% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 294 | 39.46% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 173 | 23.22% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 80 | 10.74% |

|  | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. 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 | 467 | 665 | 70.54% | 54.00% | 70.23% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 253 | 745 | 39.81% | 39.00% | 33.96% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable**

Several factors have likely contributed to the slippage in the percent of infants and toddlers who functioning within age expectations with regard to the use of appropriate behaviors to meet one’s needs. These include Maine’s more restrictive eligibility criteria (Category C), an increase in the incidence of Autism Spectrum Disorder, and the regional prevalence of socioeconomic factors which significantly impact the health and development of infants, toddlers, and their families. Another factor which likely impacted Maine’s reporting is continued clarification on the accurate scoring of the Child Outcome Summary form.

**Will your separate report be just the at-risk infants and toddlers or aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C?**

XXX

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| **A1** | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **A1** | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **A1 AR** | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **A1 AR** | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **A2** | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **A2** | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **A2 AR** | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **A2 AR** | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **B1** | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **B1** | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **B1 AR** | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **B1 AR** | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **B2** | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **B2** | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **B2 AR** | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **B2 AR** | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **C1** | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **C1** | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **C1 AR** | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **C1 AR** | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **C2** | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **C2** | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **C2 AR** | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| **C2 AR** | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target A1 >= | XXX | XXX |
| A1 AR | XXX |  |
| Target A2 >= | XXX | XXX |
| A2 AR | XXX | XXX |
| Target B1 >= | XXX | XXX |
| B1 AR | XXX | XXX |
| Target B2 >= | XXX | XXX |
| B2 AR | XXX | XXX |
| Target C1 >= | XXX | XXX |
| C1 AR | XXX | XXX |
| Target C2 >= | XXX | XXX |
| C2 AR | XXX | XXX |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed**

XXX

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

| **Not including at-risk infants and toddlers** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | XXX | XXX |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | XXX | XXX |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |

| **Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | XXX | XXX |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | XXX | XXX |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |

| **Not including at-risk infants and toddlers** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. 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 | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

**Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable**

XXX

| **Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. 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 | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

**Provide reasons for A1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for A2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable**

XXX

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

| **Not including at-risk infants and toddlers** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | XXX | XXX |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | XXX | XXX |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |

| **Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | XXX | XXX |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | XXX | XXX |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |

| **Not including at-risk infants and toddlers** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. 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 | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

**Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable**

XXX

| **Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. 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 | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

**Provide reasons for B1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for B2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

| **Not including at-risk infants and toddlers** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | XXX | XXX |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | XXX | XXX |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |

| **Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | XXX | XXX |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | XXX | XXX |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |

| **Not including at-risk infants and toddlers** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. 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 | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

**Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable**

XXX

| **Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. 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 | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

**Provide reasons for C1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for C2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program**.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State’s part C exiting 618 data | 985 |
| The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program. | 322 |

|  | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |
| Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? |  |
| If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan. |  |

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

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

**Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”**

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

Maine uses the ECO process for COS. The form has been built into the statewide data system with validations to ensure every child has a COS form on file at entry and at exit from EI services if they have been in services for more than six months.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 3 - OSEP Response

The State did not, as required by the measurement table, provide targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

## 3 - Required Actions

# Indicator 4: Family Involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Results indicator:** Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

A. Know their rights;

B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and

C. Help their children develop and learn.

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source. State must describe the data source in the SPP/APR.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children’s needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling of families participating in Part C is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the families responding are not representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to families (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person), if a survey was used, and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 4 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| A | 2006 | Target>= | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% |
| A | 76.00% | Data | 96.41% | 97.74% | 96.74% | 96.55% | 94.05% |
| B | 2006 | Target>= | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% |
| B | 85.00% | Data | 95.96% | 98.19% | 97.65% | 96.55% | 97.62% |
| C | 2006 | Target>= | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% |
| C | 88.00% | Data | 95.07% | 97.29% | 99.06% | 96.55% | 96.43% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target A>= | 92.00% | 92.00% |
| Target B>= | 92.00% | 92.00% |
| Target C>= | 92.00% | 92.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDS State IEU utilizes the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State Performance Plan (SPP) and annual Performance Report (APR) including revisions and setting targets. In addition, the SICC also discusses Part C trends and identifies priorities for Maine’s Part C program. The SICC currently meets quarterly, however a recent infusion of new members has resulted in its reinvigoration and more frequent meetings are likely.  
  
CDS also works closely with regional site leadership and staff, contracted providers, and other State entities such as the Maine Education Center for Deaf/Hard of Hearing, the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research, Maine Families Home Visiting, Maine Center for Disease Control’s Children with Special Healthcare Needs, Child Welfare, and Early Head Start. These collaborations allow for the pooling of resources and increase stakeholder engagement with the Part C Programs. As a result, those stakeholders impact, both directly and indirectly, Maine’s performance on federal indicators.  
  
CDS is also involved in a number of initiatives in Maine where information is gathered from and shared in relation to Early Intervention Services and the success and challenges the State faces for infants and toddlers. Like the SICC these initiatives have cross sector representation.

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The number of families to whom surveys were distributed | 1,025 |
| Number of respondent families participating in Part C | 142 |
| A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 135 |
| A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 142 |
| B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 137 |
| B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 142 |
| C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 137 |
| C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 142 |

|  | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2) | 94.05% | 92.00% | 95.07% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2) | 97.62% | 92.00% | 96.48% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2) | 96.43% | 92.00% | 96.48% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for part A slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for part B slippage, if appilcable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for part C slippage, if applicable**

XXX

|  | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |
| If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? |  |
| If the plan has changed, please provide the sampling plan. |  |

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

|  | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a collection tool used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool? | NO |
| If your collection tool has changed, upload it here | XXX |
| The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. | YES |

**If not, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

**Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.**

Data were collected in the Summer of 2019. All families of children receiving services through the nine regional sites (Part C and 619) received a parent survey via a text message or emaill. 1025 Part C families were contacted to complete the survey and 142 responded, yielding a response rate of 13.85%. This response rate is lower than the last few FFY reporting years. Analyses of representativeness by gender and race/ethnicity were conducted. Both aligned with CDS Population and Maine’s Demographics. Responses were proportionate to the size of the regional sites.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 4 - OSEP Response

The State did not, as required by the measurement table, provide targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator.  
  
The State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the State reported in its narrative that "data were collected in the Winter of 2020," which is the FFY 2019 (July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020) reporting period. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

## 4 - Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (*EMAPS*)) and Census (for the denominator).

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State’s reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | 2005 | 0.65% |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target >= | 0.82% | 0.82% | 0.82% | 0.82% | 0.82% |
| Data | 0.63% | 0.65% | 0.62% | 0.74% | 0.61% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 0.83% | 0.83% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The CDS State IEU utilizes the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State Performance Plan (SPP) and annual Performance Report (APR) including revisions and setting targets. In addition, the SICC also discusses Part C trends and identifies priorities for Maine’s Part C program. The SICC currently meets quarterly, however a recent infusion of new members has resulted in its reinvigoration and more frequent meetings are likely.  
  
CDS also works closely with regional site leadership and staff, contracted providers, and other State entities such as the Maine Education Center for Deaf/Hard of Hearing, the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research, Maine Families Home Visiting, Maine Center for Disease Control’s Children with Special Healthcare Needs, Child Welfare, and Early Head Start. These collaborations allow for the pooling of resources and increase stakeholder engagement with the Part C Programs. As a result, those stakeholders impact, both directly and indirectly, Maine’s performance on federal indicators.  
  
CDS is also involved in a number of initiatives in Maine where information is gathered from and shared in relation to Early Intervention Services and the success and challenges the State faces for infants and toddlers. Like the SICC these initiatives have cross sector representation.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/10/2019 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs | 75 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin | 06/20/2019 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 | 12,409 |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 75 | 12,409 | 0.61% | 0.83% | 0.60% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Compare your results to the national data**

Maine continues to utilize highly restrictive eligibility criteria (Category C) which limits the percentage of infants and toddlers determined eligible for Part C services. It's current Identification rate from Birth to 1 is below the national identification rate.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 5 - OSEP Response

The State did not, as required by the measurement table, provide a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data collected under IDEA section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (*EMAPS*)) and Census (for the denominator).

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State’s reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

## 6 - Indicator Data

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | 2005 | 2.89% |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target >= | 2.81% | 2.81% | 2.81% | 2.81% | 2.81% |
| Data | 2.17% | 2.30% | 2.34% | 2.43% | 2.39% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 2.90% | 2.90% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The CDS State IEU utilizes the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State Performance Plan (SPP) and annual Performance Report (APR) including revisions and setting targets. In addition, the SICC also discusses Part C trends and identifies priorities for Maine’s Part C program. The SICC currently meets quarterly, however a recent infusion of new members has resulted in its reinvigoration and more frequent meetings are likely.  
  
CDS also works closely with regional site leadership and staff, contracted providers, and other State entities such as the Maine Education Center for Deaf/Hard of Hearing, the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research, Maine Families Home Visiting, Maine Center for Disease Control’s Children with Special Healthcare Needs, Child Welfare, and Early Head Start. These collaborations allow for the pooling of resources and increase stakeholder engagement with the Part C Programs. As a result, those stakeholders impact, both directly and indirectly, Maine’s performance on federal indicators.  
  
CDS is also involved in a number of initiatives in Maine where information is gathered from and shared in relation to Early Intervention Services and the success and challenges the State faces for infants and toddlers. Like the SICC these initiatives have cross sector representation.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/10/2019 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs | 935 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin | 06/20/2019 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 | 37,968 |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 935 | 37,968 | 2.39% | 2.90% | 2.46% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Compare your results to the national data**

Maine continues to utilize highly restrictive eligibility criteria (Category C) which limits the percentage of infants and toddlers determined eligibile for Part C services. It's current Identification rate from Birth to 3 is below the national identification rate.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 6 - OSEP Response

The State did not, as required by the measurement table, provide a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address the timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.

**Measurement**

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

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

**Instructions**

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | 2005 | 94.40% |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 82.52% | 74.48% | 81.36% | 98.45% | 91.20% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline** | **Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,352 | 1,409 | 91.20% | 100% | 95.95% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances**

**This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.**

0

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

State database

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

XXX

**Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).**

Data collected from the full reporting period of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

**Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.**

Data were collected from the State database (CINC) for all infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the reporting period of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019. The full year data has historically been used to calculate this indicator. Findings of noncompliance were made based on these data, as appropriate.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2017 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that the 6 regional CDS sites with incidents of noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements specific to the 45-day timeline. Specifically, the CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from the State data base (CINC), regional CDS site self-assessments, and compliance reports submitted by each regional site to verify that the 6 regional CDS sites with incidents of noncompliance had achieved 100% compliance in meeting the 45-day timeline.

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

The CDS State IEU verified that individual cases of noncompliance which occurred in FFY 2017 had been corrected and that an assessment, evaluation and initial IFSP meeting occurred for all affected infants and toddlers, although beyond the 45-day timeline. Individual child records were reviewed, an IFSP was completed although late.

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;

B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

**Instructions**

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to “opt-out” of the referral. Under the State’s opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State’s Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | 2005 | 69.00% |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.81% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

**Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday. (yes/no)**

YES

**If no, please explain.**

| **Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 656 | 656 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances**   
**This number will be added to the “Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services” field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.**

0

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

State database

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

XXX

**Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).**

Selection from the full reporting period of July 1, 2018 through June 30,2019.

**Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.**

Data were collected from the State database (CINC) for all children for the reporting period of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019. The full year data has historically been used to calculate this indicator.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

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

XXX

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

## 8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 8A - OSEP Response

## 8A - Required Actions

# Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;

B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

**Instructions**

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to “opt-out” of the referral. Under the State’s opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State’s Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | 2005 | 100.00% |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

**Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA**

YES

**If no, please explain.**

| **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 656 | 656 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Number of parents who opted out**

**This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.**

0

**Describe the method used to collect these data**

Data were collected from the State database (CINC) for all children for the reporting period of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019. The full year data has historically been used to calculate this indicator.

**Do you have a written opt-out policy? (yes/no)**

NO

**If yes, is the policy on file with the Department? (yes/no)**

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

State database

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

XXX

**Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).**

Data were collected from the State database (CINC) for all children for the reporting period of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019. The full year data has historically been used to calculate this indicator.

**Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.**

Data were collected from the State database (CINC) for all children for the reporting period of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019. The full year data has historically been used to calculate this indicator.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

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

XXX

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

## 8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 8B - OSEP Response

## 8B - Required Actions

# Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;

B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

**Instructions**

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to “opt-out” of the referral. Under the State’s opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State’s Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | 2005 | 87.00% |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 83.46% | 83.85% | 80.24% | 90.45% | 97.45% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

**Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services (yes/no)**

YES

**If no, please explain.**

| **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 631 | 656 | 97.45% | 100% | 96.63% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference**

**This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.**

3

**Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances**

**This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.**

0

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

State database

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

XXX

**Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).**

Selection from the full reporting period of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

**Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.**

Date were collected from the State database (CINC) for all children for the reporting period of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019. The full year data has historically been used to calculate this indicator. Findings of noncompliance were made based on these data, as appropriate.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2017 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that the 4 regional CDS sites with incidents of noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements specific to conducting a transition conference at least 90 days prior to a potentially eligible toddler’s third birthday. Specifically, the CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from the State data base (CINC), regional CDS site self-assessments, and compliance reports submitted by each regional site to verify that the 4 regional CDS sites with incidents of noncompliance had achieved 100% compliance in conducting transition conferences within the required timeframe.

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

The CDS State IEU verified that individual cases of noncompliance which occurred in FFY 2017 had been corrected and that a transition conference had been conducted for all affected toddlers, although less than 90 days from their third birthday. Individual child records were reviewed. A transition conference occurred although late.

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

## 8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 8C - OSEP Response

The State did not provide the reasons for delay, as required by the measurement table.  
  
OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2017 SPP/APR required the State to demonstrate, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that the remaining eight uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 were corrected. However, the State only provided information on the correction of three of the remaining uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016, as opposed to the eight uncorrected findings the State was required to report on in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR.

## 8C - Required Actions

# Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (*EMAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.

This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.**

**Select yes to use target ranges.**

Target Range not used

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Provide an explanation below.**

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/11/2019 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 0 |
| SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/11/2019 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 0 |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDS State IEU utilizes the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State Performance Plan (SPP) and annual Performance Report (APR) including revisions and setting targets. In addition, the SICC also discusses Part C trends and identifies priorities for Maine’s Part C program. The SICC currently meets quarterly, however a recent infusion of new members has resulted in its reinvigoration and more frequent meetings are likely.  
  
CDS also works closely with regional site leadership and staff, contracted providers, and other State entities such as the Maine Education Center for Deaf/Hard of Hearing, the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research, Maine Families Home Visiting, Maine Center for Disease Control’s Children with Special Healthcare Needs, Child Welfare, and Early Head Start. These collaborations allow for the pooling of resources and increase stakeholder engagement with the Part C Programs. As a result, those stakeholders impact, both directly and indirectly, Maine’s performance on federal indicators.  
  
CDS is also involved in a number of initiatives in Maine where information is gathered from and shared in relation to Early Intervention Services and the success and challenges the State faces for infants and toddlers. Like the SICC these initiatives have cross sector representation.

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target>= | 6.00% | 6.00% | 6.00% | 6.00% | 6.00% |
| Data |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target>= | 0.00% |  |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 |  | 0.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**Targets**

| **FFY** | 2018 (low) | 2018 (high) | 2019 (low) | 2019 (high) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target (low)** | **FFY 2018 Target (high)** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 9 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2018. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (*EMAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = ((2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Provide an explanation below**

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/11/2019 | 2.1 Mediations held | 0 |
| SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/11/2019 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/11/2019 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 0 |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The CDS State IEU utilizes the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State Performance Plan (SPP) and annual Performance Report (APR) including revisions and setting targets. In addition, the SICC also discusses Part C trends and identifies priorities for Maine’s Part C program. The SICC currently meets quarterly, however a recent infusion of new members has resulted in its reinvigoration and more frequent meetings are likely.  
  
CDS also works closely with regional site leadership and staff, contracted providers, and other State entities such as the Maine Education Center for Deaf/Hard of Hearing, the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research, Maine Families Home Visiting, Maine Center for Disease Control’s Children with Special Healthcare Needs, Child Welfare, and Early Head Start. These collaborations allow for the pooling of resources and increase stakeholder engagement with the Part C Programs. As a result, those stakeholders impact, both directly and indirectly, Maine’s performance on federal indicators.  
  
CDS is also involved in a number of initiatives in Maine where information is gathered from and shared in relation to Early Intervention Services and the success and challenges the State faces for infants and toddlers. Like the SICC these initiatives have cross sector representation.

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | 2005 |  |  |  |  |
| **FFY** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Target>= | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% |
| Data | 100.00% |  |  |  | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target>= | 86.00% |  |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 0 | 100.00% | 86.00% |  | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Targets**

| **FFY** | 2018 (low) | 2018 (high) | 2019 (low) | 2019 (high) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2017 Data** | **FFY 2018 Target (low)** | **FFY 2018 Target (high)** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## 10 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2018. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## 10 - Required Actions

# Certification

**Instructions**

**Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.**

**Certify**

**I certify that I am the Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.**

**Select the certifier’s role**

Designated Lead Agency Director

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

**Name:**

Jonathan Hachey

**Title:**

Data Manager

**Email:**

jonathan.hachey@yahoo.com

**Phone:**

2074411127

**Submitted on:**

04/28/20 6:23:31 PM