

ME Part B

FFY2017 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The Introduction sections below address Maine's General Supervision, Technical Assistance, and Professional Development systems, Stakeholder Involvement, and Public Reporting.

Additionally, Maine received technical assistance from several sources in FFY2017 and took actions based on the technical assistance in support of the following initiatives:

1. Disproportionality

On August 7 and 8, 2017, Maine Department of Education (MDOE) received technical assistance from IDEA Data Center (IDC) personnel on the use of the IDC's Success Gaps Toolkit for assessing LEA racial/ethnic disproportionality across multiple disproportionality categories (e.g., discipline, disability identification) and exploring possible root causes. The two-day on-site training for MDOE's Special Services Team involved an overview of the Success Gaps Toolkit, step-by-step processes and instructions to use at the local level, practice in the disaggregation of data to identify success gaps, data tools to utilize with LEAs to assess potential root causes, review of a whitepaper research brief, and review of a self-assessment rubric.

MDOE also benefited from IDC's Peer-to-Peer Exchanges on Disproportionality, which occurred on 8/22/17, 10/03/17, 11/07/17, 12/05/17, 1/02/18, and 4/20/18. These meetings focused on ways to engage stakeholders in implementing a standard methodology for assessing disproportionality, factors contributing to significant disproportionality, and the implementation of Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS).

Based on the technical assistance provided, Special Services personnel met with LEA superintendents and special education directors to discuss the method for assessing disproportionality and use of the Success Gaps Toolkit when disproportionality disproportionality is found.

2. RDA (Results-Driven Accountability)

Maine continues to received technical assistance on the development and implementation of Results-Driven Accountability (RDA) from the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI). NCSI has supported Maine with RDA through form of multiple virtual meetings, Face-to-Face Collaborative Conferences, and on-site meetings in Maine for a review of the General Supervision System (GSS) including the integrated monitoring activities concluding with the mapping out next steps in the RDA process. Maine dedicated 1.5 days for NCSI to work through systems alignment at the DOE, on August 15th and 16th, 2018.

Additionally, IDC provided technical assistance regarding tiered monitoring with development and movement towards implementation based on Maine's data. The trainings involved the review of results-driven general supervision systems, methods to improve data quality and data use, support to improve results, authentic stakeholder engagement, and opportunities to share relevant strategies, experiences, lessons, and resources. Based on this assistance, Maine DOE conducted monthly meetings with six pilot LEAs between November 2017 and May 2018 to share the information and assist pilot LEAs to access, understand, and disaggregate data relevant to student results. Additional two team members attended the IDC conference on February 21st and 22nd gaining knowledge of data literacy and the use of IDEA data to make data driven decisions.

3. Transition

Maine has engaged with the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) for technical assistance on B-13. NTACT's assistance included working with LEAs using a newly created curricula from the University of Massachusetts Medical School (UMMS) and the implementation of three newly created curricula (Translating Evidence to Support Transitions or TEST). The TEST program delivers several curricula to support student-led post-secondary transition planning, career and technical education, and community partnerships for children identified with a mental health diagnosis. MDOE has sponsored this work to ensure that IEPs include quality employment-focused goals and increase readiness for employment and self-supportive choices. Fifteen districts have been trained and supported by TEST as of March 1, 2018, and MDOE's next steps involve coaching and providing ongoing support of these districts. Four districts were chosen to deliver and collect data on the Career and Technical (CTE) curricula. Based on the data collected during the use of the curricula, final versions of each curricula are being made available to all school districts in Maine to support better post-secondary outcomes for children identified with mental health diagnoses.

MDOE also received assistance on our state plan from NTACT at the Capacity Building Institute in May 2018 and from the Division of Career Development and Transition, November 2018, a national organization that works in collaboration with NTACT. The technical assistance included an introduction to resources for services and activities that will assist children with disabilities with planning and achievement of post-secondary goals, new research specific to transition and networking with other states on best practices be used supported by data collected. This training included face-to-face technical assistance bi-annually and ongoing feedback based on self-assessments and the state plan. In the spring of 2019, IDC, in collaboration with NTACT, will also provide technical assistance for tiered monitoring and implementation focusing on transition.

4. SSIP (State Systemic Improvement Plan)

IDC provided technical assistance to MDOE on multiple aspects of SSIP administration, documentation, stakeholder engagement, and scale-up/sustainability through numerous phone calls and emails throughout 2017-2018. IDC personnel served as thought-partners with Maine personnel on the format and content of the November 2018 stakeholder meeting. Based on this technical assistance, the Maine DOE Math Specialist and other DOE personnel led participants through potential scale-up models, provided a conceptual framework for stakeholders, and gathered feedback and suggestions. Additionally, the external evaluator discussed the evaluation results. IDC and NCSI personnel also reviewed Maine's draft SSIP Phase III Year 3 Report and, based on their input, Maine improved and clarified the report.

5. Fiscal

Maine has received training and technical assistance from the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR), IDEA Data Center (IDC), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), and National Center for Systematic Improvement (NCSI) during FFY2017. Assistance was been provided by CIFR and NCSI by way of monthly TA calls and attendance at the IDEA Fiscal Forum. IDC assisted Maine in clarifying of new fiscal data requirements on the EMAPS report and significant disproportionality data methodology and requirements. The technical assistance and trainings were attended by the Maine IDEA Fiscal Coordinator and the Director of Special Education.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

261

General Supervision System:

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

Schools in the State of Maine are organized into School Administrative Units (SAUs) as defined by Maine Statute, 20-A MRSA Section 1 (26): "School administrative unit" means the state-approved unit of school administration and includes a municipal school unit, school administrative district, community school district, regional school unit or any other municipal or quasi-municipal corporation responsible for operating or constructing public schools, except that it does not include a career and technical education region. Beginning July 1, 2009, "school administrative unit" means the state-approved unit of school administration and includes only the following:

1. A municipal school unit;
2. A regional school unit formed pursuant to chapter 103-A;
3. An alternative organizational structure as approved by the commissioner and approved by the voters;
4. A school administrative district that does not provide public education for the entire span of kindergarten to grade 12 that has not reorganized as a

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

regional school unit pursuant to chapter 103-A;

5. A community school district that has not reorganized as a regional school unit pursuant to chapter 103- A;
6. A municipal or quasi-municipal district responsible for operating public schools that has not reorganized as a regional school unit pursuant to chapter 103-A;
7. A municipal school unit, school administrative district, community school district, regional school unit or any other quasi-municipal district responsible for operating public schools that forms a part of an alternative organizational structure approved by the commissioner; and
8. A public charter school authorized under chapter 112 by an entity other than a local school board. Throughout this APR, the terms SAU, LEA and district will be used interchangeably.

Child Development Services (CDS) is the governmental entity that serves as an Intermediate Educational Unit (IEU) of the Maine Department of Education (Maine DOE). As described in state statute: The Maine DOE 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).

The General Supervision System (GSS) manages and oversees the needs of children with disabilities ages birth to 20, as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and overseen by the federal Office of Special Education Programs. GSS assumes the following responsibilities in seven components:

State Performance Plan (SPP). The SPP is an accountability mechanism for the State and Maine school administrative units (SAUs), providing a measureable indication of Maine's performance in specific statutory priority areas of IDEA. Maine Department of Education (DOE) is responsible for the SPP. Maine DOE's data manager works collaboratively with the federal programs coordinator for the collection of State and LEA data and performance measures, corrections of noncompliance and activities supporting LEAs improving results for children with disabilities. The CDS Deputy Director and Quality Assurance Director are responsible for the collection of CDS data and performance measures, corrections of noncompliance and activities supporting CDS sites improving results for pre-school children with disabilities. Outcomes of the SPP inform monitoring activities (e.g., child find, transition from early intervention and postsecondary transition planning). Outcomes also inform practices in professional development through the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) (e.g., LRE and postsecondary transition planning). APRs are published each year in order to document progress.

The requirement for public reporting on LEA performance is a critical provision in ensuring accountability and focusing on improved results for children with disabilities. Public reporting for the preschool population is incorporated within the APR. LEA profiles are used as the basis for determinations of LEA program performance. Each indicator is evaluated for level of determination to provide the LEA with measurement-specific feedback on their implementation of IDEA with regard to the SPP indicators. An overall determination is assigned to each LEA in alignment with the requirements of the State Performance Plan (SPP): Meets Requirements; Needs Assistance; Needs Intervention; or Needs Substantial Intervention. These determinations set the level of support and intervention provided, and define areas of required action and follow-up. Data profiles for LEAs are posted on the Maine DOE website: <https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed/data/public>

Policies, Procedures & Effective Implementation. The State of Maine has policies, procedures and effective implementation of practices that are aligned with and support the implementation of IDEA. The policies and procedures include descriptions of methods the State will use to detect non-compliance and ensure correction of non-compliance when found. Effective implementation of policies, procedures and practices also addresses program improvement through planning, coordination, incentives and follow-up. Policies, procedures, and effective implementation or practices, aligned with IDEA, are designed to support program improvement and focus attention on specific areas of compliance and program performance as identified through an analysis of data.

Resources including links to the IDEA, Chapter 101: Maine Unified Special Education Regulation Birth to Age Twenty, Policy on Standards-Based Individualized Education Program (IEP) Goals, and frequently asked questions are available on the following webpage: <https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed>.

Data on Processes & Results. As a part of the State's general supervision responsibilities, a chain of events occurs when data for students receiving special education are used for decision-making about program management and improvement.

- - Collection and verification
 - Examination and analysis
 - Reporting of data
 - Status determination
 - Improvement

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) section 618(a) (for children ages 3-21) and section 642 (for birth through age 2) requires that states make specific special education data available to the public. Links to 618 data are available on the following webpage: <https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed/data/public>. Additionally, assessment data are available on the following webpage: https://www.maine.gov/doe/Testing_Accountability/MECAS/results.

Targeted Technical Assistance & Professional Development. Targeted technical assistance and professional development enable Maine DOE and CDS to direct and impact the quality of the effective implementation of policies and procedures. Technical assistance, as part of an effective system of general supervision, is linked to the SPP indicators and outcomes for students. Technical assistance and capacity-building activities are implemented at varying levels and through multiple means such as websites, documents, coaching, mentoring, training of trainers, local, regional and/or statewide meetings and conferences, direct training from state personnel or from other resources.

- Listen & Learn Series. This biweekly webinar series is intended to offer professional development and technical assistance for special education directors and regional CDS directors in the field.
- State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Maine's SSIP, entitled Math4ME, provides professional development on math content and evidence-based teaching practices to instructors who teach math to students with disabilities. Trained teachers additionally receive coaching during the school year from a Teacher-Leader who has received advanced training on math content and pedagogy. Details of the Math4ME initiative are described in Indicator 17 of the Annual Performance Report.

Effective Dispute Resolution. The timely resolution of complaints, mediations and due process actions is required for complaint dispute resolutions. Effective Dispute Resolution addresses matters related to due process procedures such as mediations, hearings and complaint investigations. The due process team provides training for mediators and hearing officials, school personnel, agency personnel and parents. Technical assistance is available to school districts and parents.

- Due Process Hearing Decisions. Maine's Hearing Decisions (referred to as "complaint" decisions under the IDEA) are the opinions of hearing officers assigned to determine whether violations of law under IDEA and/or State special education laws or regulations have occurred. Findings of violation result in a hearing order.
- State Complaint Investigation Reports. Maine's State Complaint Investigation Reports contain findings of Maine's Education Commissioner as to whether violations of law under IDEA and/or State special education laws or regulations have occurred. Findings of violation typically result in a corrective action plan.
- Dispute Resolution Procedures & Forms. Guidance regarding mediations, individual and systemic State complaint investigations, and hearings is provided. Model forms with the elements required under the IDEA are also available.

Integrated Monitoring Activities. The Maine Department of Education Office of Special Services and Child Development Services implement the birth to twenty (B-20) General Supervision System to manage and oversee all aspects of effective implementation and integrated monitoring activities. Evaluations and interventions focus on improving infant, toddler and school-age student outcomes. The process is designed to enhance partnerships among the Maine DOE Office of Special Services, Child Development Services (CDS), LEAs, other educational and community agencies, service providers, and parents in implementing Part C and Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). These partnerships focus on early intervention and special education services and systems that directly impact results for children, and on the development and implementation of improvement strategies to address identified needs.

The Maine Department of Education monitoring activities are dedicated to improving educational results and purposeful outcomes for all children with disabilities. The Department continues to ensure districts and regional CDS sites provide programs and services for children with disabilities as described and required under federal law Section 616 of the 2004 Amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Multiple data sources and methods are used to monitor every SAU in the state. Integrated on-site and off-site monitoring activities ensure Maine's capacity to identify and correct noncompliance and facilitate improved performance. The Department has certain requirements for monitoring activities for public schools, including charter school programs and regional programs, and also for special purpose private school programs.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Monitoring programs address the GSS activity of Improvement and Correction through the development of findings after the on-site and desk audit and implementation of the corrective action plan by LEAs and special purpose private schools.

- **Preschool Special Education:** Child Development Services implements CDS site monitoring, findings, and corrections, examining for compliance with IDEA and Maine Unified Special Education Regulations, and to increase and improve outcomes for identified children. All CDS sites are monitored annually, provided letter of findings, required to submit corrective action plans and are provided determinations. The Commissioner of Education provides certification of the information by submitting the letters of findings and determinations to all sites.
- **Public Special Education Program Monitoring:** Program review for all SAUs involves both desk audits and site visits in accordance with the General Supervision System, which includes:
 1. Program review geared towards correcting noncompliance with indicators in the State Performance Plan (SPP).
 2. Focused monitoring activities geared toward identifying solutions and activities to enhance and improve performance.
 3. Technical assistance geared toward identifying solutions and activities to enhance and improve outcomes for children receiving special education services.

Maine DOE has a projected four-year monitoring cycle. This cycle may also be used to assist the Maine DOE in planning and delivering statewide professional development and technical assistance. Each year, the General Supervision System on-site and desk audits for compliance monitoring include record reviews, interviews, and document reviews to identify noncompliance and assess growth toward federal and state targets for special education. Program review is a process which purposefully selects priority areas to examine for compliance and FAPE. The Maine DOE examines identified areas for compliance to increase and improve outcomes for identified children. The Maine DOE uses an improvement planning process to ensure correction of noncompliance that can be accomplished in a timely manner based on the development of the Electronic Monitoring Tool (EMT). Additionally, Maine DOE has joined a multi-state collaborative to develop multi-tiered systems of support that integrate performance elements into yearly monitoring. The intent of this initiative is to focus more on student outcomes rather than solely focusing on compliance.

Charter School Special Education Program Monitoring: The Charter School Commission collaborates with the Maine DOE, Office of Special Services to ensure that policies and procedures are in place to provide a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) for students with disabilities according to the regulations set forth by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations (MUSER).

The Office of Special Services provides two years of individualized support as charter schools further refine their special education programs. After the charter school's second full year of operation, it is entered into a monitoring "cohort" with other public schools.

Special Purpose Private School Program Monitoring: The Office of Special Services program monitoring is dedicated to improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities. The Maine DOE continues to ensure that children placed in out-of-district placements, including Special Purpose Private Schools and hospital programs, are provided programs and services for children with disabilities as described by and required under federal law Section 616 of the 2004 Amendments to the Individual with Disabilities Act (IDEA). The requirements for continuing program approval for Special Purpose Private Schools can be found in the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations (MUSER), Chapter 101, Section XII, 1.A-E.

Program monitoring of Special Purpose Private Schools occurs on a three-year cycle, and consists of both document submission and a site visit.

Fiscal Accountability. The state system of general supervision includes mechanisms to provide oversight in the distribution and use of IDEA funds at the state and local level. The State of Maine has procedures ensuring that fiscal resources are directed to areas needing improvement. The Maine DOE Federal Grant Fiscal Guidance (<https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed/fiscal>) is a starting reference point to ensure fiscal accountability with federal and state regulations. Webinars and other resources are available to assist LEAs in the fiscal monitoring process. Activities are being developed to address and support LEAs determined to be high risk as a result of inadequate fiscal procedures that may be accompanied by additional programming concerns.

Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions. Within the State's Integrated Monitoring Activities LEAs receive results of on-site and desk reviews of their policies and procedures for ensuring a free and appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. Findings of noncompliance are identified, LEAs are required to participate in a corrective action plan to correct noncompliance and participate in improvement activities to establish procedures that lead to positive outcomes for students (see Component 6: Integrated Monitoring Activities). Results of monitoring activities and student outcome data on the State Performance Plan are publicly reported on determinations made for LEAs every year.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

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 LEAs.

Maine DOE and Child Development Services (CDS) provide a range of technical assistance to improve performance from minimal assistance to substantial interventions. Technical assistance is implemented at varying levels and through multiple means such as websites, local, regional and/or state-wide meetings and conferences, virtual or direct training from state personnel or from other resources.

Maine DOE and CDS have several mechanisms in place to ensure high quality, evidence based practice technical assistance and support to LEAs occurs in a timely manner. Structures that exist within the Office of Special Services and CDS connect to professional development initiatives across the Department of Education and through National TA Centers to provide technical assistance that is cross-collaborative.

Targeted technical assistance: As needs arise Maine DOE is able to direct the quality of the effective implementation of policies and procedures through targeted technical assistance. The department is informed of needs directly by districts, regional CDS sites, contracted providers, community members, families or the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC). Technical assistance is then designed to meet the needs of the LEA and can take any variety of forms, including on-line resources, documents, coaching, mentoring, and training of trainers or leader teams. In addition, Maine DOE regularly communicates with LEAs regarding current issues and offers guidance in a publication called the Maine DOE Update.

Listen and Learn Series: This biweekly webinar series is intended to offer professional development and technical assistance for special education directors in the field. The Office of Special Services offers a Listen & Learn webinar series that is typically accessed by teacher leaders in the field, including special education directors, program directors and regional CDS site directors. Through a regular schedule teachers and other educators can plan to participate. In addition, these webinars are recorded and posted for access at a later date, facilitating the use of these learning opportunities by LEAs in their professional development to their own staff. Topics are identified through participant polls and feedback from the field, and have included post-secondary transition planning, related services, and services for children who are blind or visually impaired, among others.

New Directors Academy: In collaboration with the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) Maine DOE presents a multi-day training for special education directors and CDS regional directors in the field for two years or less. Trainings are provided in August and typically follow an alternating year schedule. By working with MADSEC the department is able to respond to the training needs of the State.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Professional development, as part of an effective system of general supervision, is directly linked to the SPP and to the improvement activities. Maine DOE and Child Development Services State IEU (CDSSIEU) provides a variety of opportunities to impact performance from statewide activities to regional trainings, all with a purpose of developing supports that are accessible to LEAs around the state.

Maine DOE Office of Special Services and CDSSIEU contracts and enters into working relationships with technical assistance and dissemination resources regionally and nationally to provide evidence based practice professional development (EBP PD) to educators and educator leaders, parents and interested parties. Maine continues to access support from the National Technical Assistance Center for Transition (NTACT) to improve indicator B-13 compliance. NTACT has also assisted in the dissemination of professional development addressing standards aligned IEP development. In addition, Maine DOE continues to use federal funds to support the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research (MAIER). MAIER provides TA to leader teams that operate in the LEA's.

All contractors providing technical assistance to regional sites in the State are supported by national technical assistance centers in order to provide the most current practice available. All work done by contracted individuals must be consistent with Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) SPP and APR indicators as well as Maine Unified Special Education Regulations (MUSER).

Listen & Learn Series: This biweekly webinar series is intended to offer professional development and technical assistance for special education directors and regional CDS Directors in the field. The Office of Special Services offers a Listen & Learn webinar series that is made available to educators, special education directors, program directors, Child Development Services employees, and community service providers as requested. Through a regular schedule teachers and other educators can plan to participate. In addition, these webinars are recorded and posted for access at a later date, facilitating the use of these learning opportunities by LEAs in their professional development to their own staff. Topics are identified through participant polls and feedback from the field, and have included post-secondary transition planning, related services, and services for children who are blind or visually impaired, among others.

Webinars: Webinars are intended for a more specific audience than the Listen & Learn series (e.g. Excess Cost and Maintenance of Effort).

State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Maine's SSIP, entitled Math4ME, provides professional development on math content and evidence-based teaching practices to instructors who teach math to students with disabilities. Trained teachers additionally receive coaching during the school year from a Teacher-Leader who has received advanced training on math content and pedagogy. Details of the Math4ME initiative are described in Indicator 17 of the Annual Performance Report.

Attachments

File Name

Uploaded By

Uploaded Date

No APR attachments found.

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. Membership is specified in the federal regulations and a majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three to 20. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people: two parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26); an individual with a disability; a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative from the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. A majority of the members of the panel must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). Among the members is an individual who represents the SAP on the State Systemic Improvement Plan stakeholder group. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders. They bring to the table the responsibility of representation of their own field and community level stakeholders.

The director of the Maine DOE Office of Special Services met with the SAP during their quarterly meetings throughout FFY2017. Members were informed of department priorities and current issues and advice was sought from the membership for the Maine DOE to consider in legislation, rule making, procedures and reporting. Topics included revisions to the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations and the State Systemic Improvement Plan.

Target setting activities for the new SSIP consisted of series of meetings of the SAP membership in 2013 and 2014 during which members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. These meetings included input from the public. Past performance for each indicator in the first year with comparable consistent measurement with the baseline was identified. Possible targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years. Maine DOE staff members, including the director, data manager and SPP/APR coordinator, were available to answer any statistical or practical questions related to the indicators, past performance, or the analysis leading to suggestions of targets. SAP members discussed priorities amongst themselves and arrived at recommendations for targets for all results indicators (except B-17) for the life of the SPP. Stakeholder input on the SSIP (Indicator B-17) is provided in the B-17 description.

Attachments

File Name

Uploaded By

Uploaded Date

No APR attachments found.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2016 performance of each LEA 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 2016 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2016 APR in 2018, is available.

Public reporting on LEA performance is a critical provision in ensuring accountability and focusing on improved results for children with disabilities. All LEAs receive and review on a yearly basis a letter with their determination status, the rubric "Local Determination Levels Assistance and Enforcement", and the LEA profile. Data profile designs were developed for each Local Educational Agency (LEA) in the State. The profiles provide indicator-specific performance and compliance data to the LEA and to the public for use in program improvement. The LEA profiles are used as the basis for determinations of LEA program performance. Each indicator is evaluated for level of determination to provide the LEA with measurement-specific feedback on their implementation of IDEA with regard to State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators. The individual determinations are then used to develop an overall determination with respect to the requirements of the SPP in one of the four required categories: Meets Requirements; Needs Assistance; Needs Intervention; or Needs Substantial Intervention. These determinations set the level of support and intervention provided and define areas of required action and follow-up.

1) A complete copy of Maine's FFY2016 APR, 2) FFY2016 LEA determinations, and 3) FFY2016 performance of LEAs on the SPP/APR targets are posted on the following webpage: <https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed/data/public>

Student assessment data are available on the following webpage: https://www.maine.gov/doe/Testing_Accountability/MECAS/results.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 1: Graduation**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			78.00%	80.00%	82.00%	84.00%	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%	90.00%	90.00%
Data		74.30%	77.00%	76.00%	64.70%	64.70%	65.10%	66.02%	70.12%	70.38%	70.97%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	90.00%	90.00%
Data	73.88%	72.37%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	90.00%	90.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-1 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	2,181	
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	3,010	null
SY 2016-17 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/28/2018	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	72.46%	Calculate <input type="checkbox"/>

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
2,181	3,010	72.37%	90.00%	72.46%

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

The standards for obtaining a high school diploma are outlined in Maine statute 20-A Section 4722, which can be found here: <http://www.mainelegislature.org>
5/28/2019

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

/legis/statutes/20-a/title20-asec4722.html. These standards include required numbers of courses in English, Social Studies, Mathematics, Science, and Fine Arts, and the availability of multiple pathways for demonstrating achievement of standards in these academic areas. Standards do not differ for students with IEPs; all students must meet the same requirements to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? No

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Drop Out**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:
Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			4.00%	3.50%	3.00%	3.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	19.83%	19.83%
Data		8.60%	3.50%	3.70%	3.80%	5.50%	5.50%	5.04%	5.50%	19.83%	18.55%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	19.80%	19.80%
Data	16.15%	17.23%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	19.00%	19.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-2 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- Option 1
- Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,318	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	null	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	10	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	223	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	n	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of high school students with IEPs	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
223	1,554	17.23%	19.00%	14.35%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth.

Maine uses the same calculation as that used in 618 IDEA reporting: $[(\text{The number of youth with IEPs ages 14 through 20 who exited special education due to dropping out} / \text{The number of youth with IEPs ages 14 through 20 who left high school for the reasons listed below}) * 100]$. Students are counted as dropping out when identified with one of the following exit reasons: dropped out, status unknown, and moved, not known to be continuing. The reasons for which students with IEPs may have left school are: graduating with a regular high school diploma, reaching maximum age, dropping out, and death.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? No

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Grade 3-8	2013	Target ≥										98.00%	98.00%
			Data		95.33%									98.10%
	B High School	2013	Target ≥										98.00%	98.00%
			Data											90.53%
Math	A Grade 3-8	2013	Target ≥										98.00%	98.00%
			Data		95.33%									98.05%
	B High School	2013	Target ≥										98.00%	98.00%
			Data											90.58%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Grade 3-8	Target ≥	98.00%	98.00%
		Data	90.37%	90.60%
	B High School	Target ≥	98.00%	98.00%
		Data	82.22%	90.35%
Math	A Grade 3-8	Target ≥	98.00%	98.00%
		Data	90.30%	90.63%
	B High School	Target ≥	98.00%	98.00%
		Data	82.25%	90.35%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3-8	98.00%	98.00%
	B ≥ High School	98.00%	98.00%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3-8	98.00%	98.00%
	B ≥ High School	98.00%	98.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-3B from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2017 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) Date: 12/13/2018

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	2486	2573	2585	2576	2479	2369	n	n	n	n	1941
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1260	1261	1305	1372	1401	1500					1168
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1033	1113	1079	970	837	650					463
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	120	131	127	142	135	122					137

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) Date: 12/13/2018

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	2491	2572	2589	2576	2478	2362	n	n	n	n	1942
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1263	1258	1310	1373	1400	1492					1168
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1035	1115	1078	968	838	652					464
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	120	131	127	143	134	121					137

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Grade 3-8	15,068	14,558	90.60%	98.00%	96.62%
B High School	1,941	1,768	90.35%	98.00%	91.09%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Grade 3-8	15,068	14,558	90.63%	98.00%	96.62%
B High School	1,942	1,769	90.35%	98.00%	91.09%

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

 The assessment results are publicly reported at https://www.maine.gov/doi/Testing_Accountability/MECAS/results.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Grade 3-8	2015	Target ≥					58.00%	66.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	35.00%	35.00%
			Data					35.00%	31.00%	31.00%	34.00%	32.60%	30.71%	15.79%
	B HS	2015	Target ≥					64.00%	71.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	20.00%	20.00%
			Data					15.00%	13.00%	17.00%	16.00%	13.80%	15.97%	17.82%
Math	A Grade 3-8	2015	Target ≥					50.00%	60.00%	78.00%	78.00%	78.00%	30.00%	30.00%
			Data					32.00%	29.00%	28.00%	29.00%	29.00%	26.02%	12.68%
	B HS	2015	Target ≥					43.00%	54.00%	66.00%	78.00%	66.00%	15.00%	15.00%
			Data					11.00%	13.00%	15.00%	29.00%	13.71%	15.69%	9.23%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Grade 3-8	Target ≥	45.00%	60.00%
		Data	15.11%	15.19%
	B HS	Target ≥	30.00%	50.00%
		Data	20.65%	19.71%
Math	A Grade 3-8	Target ≥	40.00%	50.00%
		Data	12.33%	11.69%
	B HS	Target ≥	25.00%	45.00%
		Data	10.34%	9.80%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3-8	75.00%	90.00%
	B ≥ HS	70.00%	90.00%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3-8	70.00%	90.00%
	B ≥ HS	70.00%	90.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-3C from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2017 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) Date: 12/13/2018

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	2413	2505	2511	2484	2373	2272	n	n	n	n	1768
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	238	285	274	218	187	261					151
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	47	51	42	27	27	22					55
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	61	58	60	86	81	52					95

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) Date: 12/13/2018

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	2418	2504	2515	2484	2372	2265	n	n	n	n	1769
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	310	203	136	99	95	126					49
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	101	61	39	22	16	14					15
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	55	78	52	79	63	60					88

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Grade 3-8	14,558	2,077	15.19%	75.00%	14.27%
B HS	1,768	301	19.71%	70.00%	17.02%

Reasons for Group B Slippage

The reason for the FFY2017 2.69% decrease in proficiency from the FFY2016 percentage is unclear, but the slight decrease occurred for all Maine high school students, not just students with IEPs. Professional development opportunities are being provided to LEAs to offer strategies to provide students access to grade-level texts with appropriate instructional support. This support is focused on data use, such as Lexile measures, to inform instructional strategies and the use of scaffolded support and practice with grade-level texts.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Grade 3-8	14,558	1,609	11.69%	70.00%	11.05%
B HS	1,769	152	9.80%	70.00%	8.59%

Reasons for Group B Slippage

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The reason for the FFY2017 1.2% decrease in proficiency from the FFY2016 percentage is unclear, but the slight decrease occurred for all Maine high school students, not just students with IEPs. Maine's State Systemic Improvement Plan is targeted to improve the fundamental understanding of mathematics for students currently in 3rd through 8th grade, and it is expected that increased understanding and proficiency will become evident at the high school level as these students continue their mathematics education.

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The assessment results are publicly reported at https://www.maine.gov/doi/Testing_Accountability/MECAS/results.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			1.00%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		1.75%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-4A from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 69

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
3	191	0%	0%	1.57%

Reasons for Slippage

Reasons for slippage are unclear; however, Maine DOE has intensified training and monitoring of LEA discipline reporting with a newly-hired MDOE staff member, improving reporting of discipline events by LEAs.

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):

- Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

State's definition of significant discrepancy: The following decision rules are used to determine if there is a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for children with disabilities:

The district must have a minimum of 10 students with IEPs enrolled. For districts meeting the n size threshold of 10, the number of students suspended or expelled over 10 days must be greater than 1 and the rate of suspension/expulsion over 10 days must be more than 3 standard deviations above the State's rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for students with disabilities.

Evaluation of data for Indicator 4A: Data from the 2016-2017 report of children with disabilities subject to disciplinary removal were examined to determine if significant discrepancies were occurring in the rates of

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days. Out of 260 districts, 191 met the n size threshold of 10 students with disabilities enrolled in the district. There were 69 districts excluded from the analysis because they did not meet the n size requirement. Three of the districts exhibited a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days.

Maine requires all districts within the audit cycle to go through a review of policies, practices and procedures. For districts identified with significant discrepancies, Maine DOE reviews specific files from each district with a compliance instrument to test compliance of each student file or policy document for 36 items. The purpose of this review is ensuring that districts are properly developing and implementing IEPs, use positive behavioral interventions and supports, and include procedural safeguards as outlined in 34 C.F.R. 300.170 (b). Each instance of noncompliance is required to be corrected and the Maine DOE requires the district to revise their policies and procedures to comply with IDEA and Maine Unified Special Education Regulations 2017.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

For districts identified with significant discrepancies, Maine DOE reviews specific files from each district with a compliance instrument to test compliance of each student file or policy document for 36 items. The purpose of this review is ensuring that districts are properly developing and implementing IEPs, use positive behavioral interventions and supports, and include procedural safeguards as outlined in 34 C.F.R. 300.170 (b). Each instance of noncompliance is required to be corrected and the Maine DOE requires the district to revise their policies and procedures to comply with IDEA and Maine Unified Special Education Regulations 2017. Maine did not identify noncompliance with the Part B requirements as a result of the review.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 69

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	0	191	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

State's definition of significant discrepancy: The following decision rules are used to determine if there is a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days by race/ethnicity among children with disabilities:

The district must have a minimum of 10 students of any race/ethnicity with IEPs enrolled. For districts meeting the n size threshold of 10, the number of students of any race/ethnicity suspended or expelled over 10 days must be greater than 1, and the rate of suspensions/expulsions over 10 days must be more than 3 standard deviations above the State's rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for students with disabilities.

Evaluation of data for Indicator 4B: Indicator 4A data were disaggregated by race and ethnicity. Out of 260 districts, 191 met the n size threshold of 10 students with disabilities of any race/ethnicity enrolled in the district. There were 69 districts excluded from the analysis because they did not meet the n size requirement. None of the districts exhibited a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity in the rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days.

If a district had exhibited a significant discrepancy, Maine would have reviewed policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. If the State had (through the review of policies, practices, and procedures) identified policies, practices, or procedures that do not comply with the requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, it would have revised (or required the affected district(s) to revise) policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Educational Environments (children 6-21)**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥				62.00%	63.00%	64.00%	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%	66.00%
		Data		57.10%	57.40%	57.00%	53.80%	56.00%	55.00%	56.00%	55.69%	55.67%	56.41%
B	2005	Target ≤				10.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%
		Data		11.20%	11.60%	11.50%	12.50%	10.60%	10.80%	10.60%	10.80%	10.71%	10.70%
C	2005	Target ≤				7.17%	3.50%	3.30%	3.10%	3.10%	3.10%	3.10%	3.10%
		Data		3.50%	3.50%	3.50%	3.40%	3.20%	3.30%	3.30%	3.29%	3.33%	3.10%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	67.00%	68.00%
	Data	56.69%	56.58%
B	Target ≤	9.00%	9.00%
	Data	10.78%	10.88%
C	Target ≤	3.10%	3.10%
	Data	3.13%	3.24%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	69.00%	70.00%
Target B ≤	9.00%	9.00%
Target C ≤	3.10%	3.10%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-5 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	30,452	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	17,178	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	3,145	null

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	807	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	100	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	28	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	17,178	30,452	56.58%	69.00%	56.41%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	3,145	30,452	10.88%	9.00%	10.33%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	935	30,452	3.24%	3.10%	3.07%

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥											
		Data											
B	2011	Target ≤											
		Data											

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥		
	Data	75.20%	74.69%
B	Target ≤		
	Data	0.74%	12.87%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥		
Target B ≤		

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-6 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	3,384	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,312	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	248	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b2. Number of children attending separate school	259	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,312	3,384	74.69%		68.32%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	null	3,384	12.87%		0%

Use a different calculation methodology

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

In Maine, children ages 3 through 5 are educated in two separate systems (Child Development Services (CDS) and Maine Department of Education (Maine DOE)), and Maine reports data for the two environments separately. FFY2017 Targets and Data are reported separately below.

Indicator 6 Disaggregated Reporting (Department of Education (DOE) and Child Development Services (CDS)):

Maine DOE:

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	1,369
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,351
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b2. Number of children attending separate school	15
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,351	1,369	98.63%	≥99.20%	98.69%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	16	1,369	1.37%	<0.80%	1.17%

Maine CDS:

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	2,015
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	961
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	247
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b2. Number of children attending separate school	244
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	961	2,015	58.88%	≥53.00%	47.69%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	491	2,015	19.31%	<12.50%	24.37%

Explanation of Slippage:

Maine 619 has implemented a new data system (CINC). Prior to implementation, Maine 619 utilized TA providers through the discovery and development phase to ensure the system captured all of the information required for the B6 LRE requirements. CINC was built using the B6 decision tree. Through the development and implementation of the data system, it was determined that the regional sites required TA on LRE and its specific

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

components. The Part B 619 Data Manager and Early Childhood Special Education Technical Advisor accessed national TA providers to provide targeted TA to the regional sites on the B6 decision tree, what the different settings mean and how to document it in a child's record.

Additionally, an example of why more children are shown to be served in a separate school or classroom is that Maine 619 has a high count of children eligible under speech or language impairment and require only speech and language services. Due to the individual needs of the child, that service may happen in a service provider location/ outside of a classroom.

With the development of specific LRE components and TA provided, the data reflects the locations in which children under school age are receiving services.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						63.00%	64.00%	64.00%	64.00%	64.00%	64.00%
		Data					63.10%	60.90%	54.00%	51.00%	46.00%	60.04%	71.79%
A2	2008	Target ≥						37.00%	38.00%	38.00%	38.00%	38.00%	38.00%
		Data					37.00%	37.00%	36.00%	40.00%	33.00%	52.46%	54.50%
B1	2008	Target ≥						66.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%	67.00%
		Data					65.50%	59.90%	61.00%	61.00%	65.00%	68.55%	72.87%
B2	2008	Target ≥						35.00%	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%	36.00%
		Data					35.40%	31.30%	33.00%	36.00%	35.00%	50.69%	50.40%
C1	2008	Target ≥						58.00%	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%	59.00%
		Data					58.30%	63.50%	54.00%	59.00%	57.00%	55.05%	66.38%
C2	2008	Target ≥						51.00%	52.00%	52.00%	52.00%	52.00%	52.00%
		Data					51.00%	53.00%	48.00%	57.00%	51.00%	68.71%	69.20%

	FFY	2015	2016
A1	Target ≥	64.00%	64.00%
	Data	69.42%	72.36%
A2	Target ≥	38.00%	38.00%
	Data	49.21%	43.24%
B1	Target ≥	67.00%	67.00%
	Data	75.37%	75.30%
B2	Target ≥	36.00%	36.00%
	Data	51.04%	42.31%
C1	Target ≥	59.00%	59.00%
	Data	66.88%	68.74%
C2	Target ≥	52.00%	52.00%
	Data	67.48%	60.57%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	64.00%	65.00%
Target A2 ≥	38.00%	39.00%
Target B1 ≥	67.00%	68.00%
Target B2 ≥	36.00%	37.00%
Target C1 ≥	59.00%	60.00%
Target C2 ≥	52.00%	53.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-7 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	1,567
--	-------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	9	0.57%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	399	25.46%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	518	33.06%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	331	21.12%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	310	19.78%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	849.00	1257.00	72.36%	64.00%	67.54%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	641.00	1567.00	43.24%	38.00%	40.91%

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	4	0.26%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	412	26.29%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	517	32.99%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	416	26.55%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	218	13.91%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	933.00	1349.00	75.30%	67.00%	69.16%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	634.00	1567.00	42.31%	36.00%	40.46%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	9	0.57%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	340	21.70%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	349	22.27%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	286	18.25%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	583	37.20%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	635.00	984.00	68.74%	59.00%	64.53%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	869.00	1567.00	60.57%	52.00%	55.46%

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? Yes

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? Yes

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.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8: Parent involvement**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? **Yes**

Will you be providing the data for preschool children separately? **No**

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			86.00%	87.00%	89.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%
Data		86.10%	87.40%	88.70%	91.00%	91.00%	90.00%	88.00%	93.90%	93.00%	93.49%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	91.00%	91.00%
Data	93.95%	91.61%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	91.00%	91.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-8 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
461	496	91.61%	91.00%	92.94%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	5.59%	8878.00
---	-------	---------

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

For the combined (school-age and preschool) percentage, the number of school-age and preschool respondents who indicated that schools facilitated parent involvement were summed and then divided by the sum of all school-age and preschool respondents. Preschool data (age 3-5) was gathered from a census of all Child Development Services sites. School-aged data is collected through monitoring activities. LEAs are assigned to cohorts that are monitored on a four year rotation ensuring that each LEA is monitored once every four years. The data for this indicator were collected during fall and spring of 2017-18.

Analyses of the sample's representativeness of the population of monitored districts were conducted for gender, age group, and race/ethnicity. Respondent data across all categories were found to be represented in the sample at least to the extent that they existed in the population or were within 5% of the population values.

The data for Child Development Services (CDS) (pre-school) and DOE are reported jointly for this indicator because the targets and baseline have been set for combined CDS and DOE data. However, Maine additionally reports CDS and DOE disaggregations - the FFY2017 data, both combined and disaggregated, are reported below.

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Overall (Combined) = $[(279 + 182) / (308 + 188)] * 100 = 92.94\%$

DOE (School Age) = $(279 / 308) * 100 = 90.58\%$

CDS = $(182 / 188) * 100 = 96.81\%$

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

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

Part B 619 data are not based on a sample, they are collected via a census, while school-age data are collected through monitoring activities (sample).

For school-age data, LEAs are assigned to cohorts that are monitored on a four year rotation ensuring that each LEA is monitored once every four years. Maine DOE provided the electronic link to the survey to all monitored LEAs and the LEAs provided the link to all parents of students with IEPs in the LEA. 7,837 survey invitations were provided to parents of Part B school-aged children, and 308 survey responses were received. The data were electronically captured from each of the surveys.

Analyses of the sample's representativeness of the population of districts were conducted for gender, age group, and race/ethnicity. Respondent data across all categories were found to be represented in the sample at least to the extent that they existed in the population or were within 5% of the population values.

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Yes

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

School-age data was gathered from a cohort consisting of 1/4 of Maine's school districts. Preschool data (age 3-5) were gathered from a census of all Child Development Services sites.

Maine DOE provided the electronic link to the survey to all monitored LEAs and the LEAs provided the link to all parents of students with IEPs in the LEA. 7,837 survey invitations were provided to parents of Part B school-aged children, and 308 survey responses were received. The percentage of parents with a child receiving special education services who reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities was 90.58%.

Analyses of the sample's representativeness of the population of monitored districts were conducted for gender, age group, and race/ethnicity. Respondent data across all categories were found to be represented in the sample at least to the extent that they existed in the population or were within 5% of the population values.

Part B 619 data were collected in the spring of 2018. All families of children receiving services through the nine regional sites (Part C and 619) received a parent survey invitation via a telephone call. 1,041 Part B (619) families were contacted to complete the survey and 188 responded. In reviewing the data, the CDS State IEU has determined the response group is representative of the CDS system.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 151

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	0	110	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Disproportionate representation is defined as a significant difference between the identification rates of students with disabilities by race/ethnic proportion and the proportionate representation of the race/ethnicity overall within the district. A significant difference is defined as a risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, and an alternate risk ratio greater than or equal to 3 when comparing the risk of special education identification of students of a given race/ethnicity to the risk of special education identification of students of all other races/ethnicities. One year of data is used in the calculations.

Multiple risk ratio measures and cell and n size criteria are used because the counts of students belonging to various racial/ethnic groups in Maine's districts often are very small. The cell size and n size of an assessed racial/ethnic group in special education must be at least 10 and 30, respectively, and a comparison group of any other racial/ethnic group in the district must be at least 10.

Maine's examination of disproportionate representation included analysis of students in all seven racial and ethnic groups: American Indian or Alaska Native, Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Asian, Black or African American, White, Hispanic or Latino, and Two or More Races. For FFY2017, 110 districts in the State met the criteria for disproportionality assessments. There were 151 districts excluded from analysis because they did not meet the minimum cell and n size requirement. No districts exhibited disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education. Therefore, there was no review to determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

No districts exhibited disproportionate representation by race/ethnicity in special education. Therefore, there was no review to determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 155

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	0	106	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Disproportionate representation is defined as a significant difference between the rates of students identified for specific disability categories by race/ethnic proportion and the proportionate representation of the race/ethnicity overall within the district. A significant difference is defined as a risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, and an alternate risk ratio greater than or equal to 3 when comparing the risk of the identification of students of a given race/ethnicity in a disability category to the risk of identification of students of all other races/ethnicities. One year of data is used in the calculations.

Multiple risk ratio measures and cell and n size criteria are used because the counts of students belonging to various racial/ethnic groups in Maine's districts often are very small. The cell size and n size of an assessed racial/ethnic group in a disability category must be at least 10 and 30, respectively, and a comparison group of any other racial/ethnic group in the district must be at least 10.

Maine's examination of disproportionate representation included analysis of students in all seven racial and ethnic groups: American Indian or Alaska Native, Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Asian, Black or African American, White, Hispanic or Latino, and Two or More Races. For FFY2017, 106 districts in the State met the criteria for disproportionality assessments. There were 155 districts excluded from analysis because they did not meet the minimum cell and n size requirements. No districts exhibited disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories. Therefore, there was no review to determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

No districts exhibited disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories. Therefore, there was no review to determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 11: Child Find**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		85.00%	91.00%	94.60%	91.30%	84.90%	88.20%	86.40%	86.00%	83.24%	84.08%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	83.02%	91.24%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
612	567	91.24%	100%	92.65%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	45
---	----

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Children Evaluated within 60 Days:

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received: 351

(b) Number of children for whose evaluations were completed within 60 days: 319

Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who were evaluated within 60 days (Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100): 90.88%

Reason for Delay	Count
CDS (no delay reason was given and/or delay was caused by regional site/staff)	15
Provider	17

Delays beyond the timeline	61-75	Over 75
	18	14

School-Aged (ages 5-20): Children aged 5-20 Evaluated within the State-Established Timeline of 45 Days:

(a) Number of children aged 5-20 for whom parental consent to evaluate was received: 261

(b) Number of children aged 5-20 whose evaluations were completed within 45 days: 248

(c) Percent of children aged 5-20 with parental consent to evaluate who were evaluated with 45 days (Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100): 95.02%

The 57 LEAs monitored received 261 parental consents for evaluation within the 30% of educational files reviewed. As indicated above, 248 evaluations were completed within the 45 school-day timeline or within an allowable extension of time pursuant to Federal Regulations and Maine Unified Special Education Regulations (MUSER). Acceptable reasons for exceptions to the timeline are those that are beyond the LEA's control, including repeated parent failure or refusal to produce the child for evaluation, excessive child absences, documented delays in making contact with a parent to schedule the evaluation, documented parent request for a delay, or the child enrolled in the LEA after parental consent was received in another LEA but before the evaluation could be completed.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

All 13 students included in (a) but not included in (b) have completed initial evaluations, but they were not within the state-established timelines. The delays for these students ranged from 1 to 19 days. Reasons for these delays were acceptable and included repeated parent failure or refusal to produce the child for evaluation, excessive child absences, documented delays in making contact with a parent to schedule the evaluation, documented parent request for a delay, or the child enrolled in the LEA after parental consent was received in another LEA but before the evaluation could be completed.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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.

Data-collection methods differ between students served under Child Development Services (CDS, which serves children ages 3-5) and school-aged students (age 5 and above).

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Data were collected through monitoring of the 9 regional CDS sites. All evaluations and eligibility determinations made between March 1, 2018 and June 30, 2018 in the were reviewed for timeliness. A total of 430 records were reviewed.

School Aged (ages 5-20): The data for this indicator are monitoring data. LEAs are assigned to cohorts that are monitored on a four year rotation ensuring that each LEA is monitored once every four years. Initial evaluation data were collected from the 57 LEAs that were monitored during FFY2017. LEAs submit the following materials:

1. evidence of signed parental consent,
2. completed evaluations for initial evaluations occurring during the 2017-18 monitoring period,
3. school calendars for evidence of "student" days and "no student" days, and
4. reasons for delay of completion of initial evaluations. LEAs are required to provide evidence of accepted reasons for delay.

The monitoring period is selected to ensure there are at least 45 school days between the date parental consent was received and the date evaluations were completed prior to submission due date. For larger LEAs this is a sample of initial evaluations occurring during the monitoring period. For smaller LEAs the submission consists of all the initial evaluations for which parental consent was received during the monitoring period.

Initial evaluation data is also obtained during site visits, during which 10% of the identified students' files are reviewed. Data collected on students whose files are randomly selected for on site review and received initial evaluation during the 2017-18 school year are identical to that submitted for desk audit; signed parental consent received by the LEA, completed evaluations and school calendar.

Data are reviewed by the public school program monitoring team and checked for accuracy and inter-observer reliability.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
46	46	0	0

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Children Evaluated Within 60 Days (or State-established timeline):

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
38	38	0	0

Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2016 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.301(c)(1) (achieved 100% compliance) and 34 CFR §§300.301(d) (exceptions to the timeline) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the regional site, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

School-Aged (ages 5-20): Children aged 5-20 Evaluated within the State-Established Timeline of 45 Days:

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
8	8	0	0

Prior to considering any finding from FFY2016 corrected, Maine DOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b), (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The time period within which each LEA with noncompliance was required to demonstrate 100% compliance was within one year of identification of noncompliance. All 8 findings of noncompliance were demonstrated and verified as meeting 100% compliance within the one year of the identification of non-compliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. The monitoring team was able to verify that the evaluations were conducted for each school-aged 5-20 child for whom consent was received, although outside of the required 45 school day timeline. Evidence for the findings of noncompliance, including paper and digital copies of evaluations and written notices, were submitted to the Maine DOE and the content was verified by members of the monitoring team ensuring all evaluations met the criteria for Indicator 11.

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

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Children Evaluated Within 60 Days (or State-established timeline):

CDS was also able to verify that an evaluation and initial IEP meeting were conducted for each child aged 3-5 for whom consent was received, although late.

Specifically, to verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from, performed on-site file reviews, and verified subsequent data submitted through regional site self-assessments and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance varied based on the level of noncompliance identified in the program.

In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, CDS State IEU also complied with the requirements to account for all instances of noncompliance identified through its database as well as on-site monitoring and other monitoring procedures; identify the level, location (regional site), and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any regional site with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit corrective action plans (CAPs). CDS State IEU and the regional site created the CAPs. These activities ranged from providing staff training, attending required TA, submitting monthly reports to the CDS State IEU and completing CAP check-in calls with the CDS State IEU.

School-Aged (ages 5-20): Children aged 5-20 Evaluated within the State-Established Timeline of 45 Days:

To verify that each LEA correctly implemented the requirements, Maine DOE reviewed and verified subsequent updated data submitted by the LEAs through corrective activities. LEAs were required to develop a plan for monitoring in the LEA to meet initial evaluation timelines. LEAs were to provide training on Child Find requirements and timelines, including the requirement to conduct an initial evaluation within 45 school days of receipt of parental consent to evaluate, and to use the LEAs timeline monitoring plan. LEAs were required to submit the following evidence: 1) outline of training, attendance at training, training plan, and 2) five parental consent to evaluate forms and evidence of date evaluation(s) received by the LEA.

The time period within which each LEA with noncompliance was required to demonstrate 100% compliance was within one year of identification of noncompliance. All 8 findings of noncompliance were demonstrated and verified as meeting 100% compliance within the one year of the identification of non-compliance, unless the child was no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The monitoring team was able to verify that the evaluations were conducted for each school-aged 5-20 child for whom consent was received, although outside of the required 45 school day timeline. Evidence for the findings of noncompliance, including paper and digital copies of evaluations and written notices, were submitted to the Maine DOE and the content was verified by members of the monitoring team ensuring all evaluations met the criteria for Indicator 11.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		97.00%	96.40%	100%	86.60%	91.70%	92.90%	95.00%	99.63%	98.89%	99.33%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	99.67%	81.62%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	320
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	27
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	172
d. Number of children for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	45
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	33
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	172	215	81.62%	100%	80.00%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f	43
--	----

Reasons for Slippage

Slippage may be attributed to the following:

- Part B case management staff are waiting until the child is close to three years old to begin the evaluations process to obtain the most accurate information on the child.
- CINC (Child Information Network Connection), the newly implemented 619 data system also tracks this information in much more detail than the old data system. The Part C system is now able to make referrals directly through CINC. Case management and site staff are still adjusting to the new system and processes put in place. Referrals from Part C are sent on the earlier side of their requirement and some children's records sit for some time before being acted upon.
- Some Part B 619 teams are waiting until the child's transition conference from C to begin the Part B 619 process, which squeezes the timeline for Part B even more in some cases.

Technical assistance will be provided to the regional site leadership and staff on the transition requirements detailing the timeline requirements and the transition checklist will be reviewed and required for all sites to use. The State Early Childhood Special Education Technical Advisor will provide and evaluate this systemic TA and that teams are beginning the transition process begins earlier for children to ensure timely evaluations and IEPs are in effect by their 3rd birthday.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Days beyond	Number of Children
0-15	5
16-30	16
31-60	14
60+	8

Reasons for Delay	Number of Children
CDS	27
Contracted provider	16

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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.

Data were collected from the State database (CINC) for all children for the reporting period of July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018. Findings of noncompliance were made based on the review of these data.

Children and families in Maine do not have the option to continue early intervention services after age 3.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
34	34	0	0

FFY 2016 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 2016 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the regional site, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

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

To verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent, performed on-site filereviews, and verified subsequent data submitted through regional site self-assessments and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance varied based on the level of noncompliance identified in the program.

CDS was also able to verify that each child referred by Part C, prior to age 3, who was found eligible for Part B, subsequently had an IEP developed, although late.

In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, CDS State IEU also complied with the requirements to account for all instances of noncompliance identified through its database as well as on-site monitoring and other monitoring procedures; identify the level, location (regional site), and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any regional site with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit CAPs. CDS State IEU and the regional site created the CAPs. These activities included providing staff training, attending required TA, submitting monthly reports to the CDS State IEU and completing CAP check-in calls with the CDS State IEU.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						88.00%	47.00%	60.40%	36.00%	63.36%	54.29%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	88.96%	94.38%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
156	164	94.38%	100%	95.12%

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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.

LEAs are assigned to cohorts that are monitored on a four year rotation, ensuring that each LEA is monitored once every four years. The data for this indicator reflect direct monitoring data. Postsecondary transition data were collected from the 57 LEAs that were monitored during FFY2017. Records for 30% of children receiving special education services in the monitored LEAs were reviewed through monitoring activities. The LEAs in the monitoring cohort performed a self-assessment of the records of 20% of their students receiving special education, and submitted the self-assessment to the Maine DOE. Maine DOE monitoring staff conducted on-site assessment of the records of an additional 10% of the LEAs students receiving special education to validate the data submitted by the LEAs through self-assessment. Postsecondary plans were evaluated using the postsecondary transition plan checklist developed by the National Technical Assistance Center for Transition (NTACT). Findings of noncompliance were made in all instances and were identified both through self-assessment and on-site assessment.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

- Yes
- No

Did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?

- Yes
- No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In Maine, public agencies must meet these requirements for students in grade 9 and above, even if the students are younger than 16. However, for the baseline and yearly reporting on this indicator, only students ages 16 and above are included.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	9	0	0

FFY 2016 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 FFY2016 corrected, Maine DOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b), (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. To verify that each LEA was correctly implementing the requirements, Maine DOE reviewed and verified subsequent data submitted by the LEAs through corrective action reports. This data demonstrated systemic correction of noncompliance. The time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance was within one year of the identification of the noncompliance. In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, Maine DOE also complied with the requirements to: account for all instances of noncompliance identified through monitoring procedures; identify the level, location, and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any LEA with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit corrected secondary transition plans developed after the finding of non-compliance.

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

LEAs with noncompliant plans reviewed during monitoring received a finding for post-secondary transition plans. Because transition plan information can be corrected, the LEAs were required to convene IEP meetings to revise the plans to meet the requirements in those cases where transition plans were found to be noncompliant. The amended plans with prior written notice were submitted to Maine DOE for review. When all instances of noncompliance were reviewed and found compliant, the LEA's finding was closed.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2016	Target ≥							35.00%	25.10%	25.10%	25.00%	25.00%
		Data						35.50%	25.00%	17.40%	23.16%	21.34%	22.98%
B	2016	Target ≥							92.00%	76.60%	76.60%	76.60%	76.60%
		Data						92.00%	76.60%	62.90%	48.00%	37.49%	62.12%
C	2016	Target ≥							94.00%	82.30%	82.30%	82.30%	82.30%
		Data						94.60%	82.30%	68.60%	82.64%	52.90%	89.38%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	25.00%	25.00%
	Data	26.30%	18.81%
B	Target ≥	76.60%	77.00%
	Data	68.87%	65.68%
C	Target ≥	82.30%	83.00%
	Data	96.16%	77.56%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	27.00%	30.00%
Target B ≥	79.00%	80.00%
Target C ≥	84.00%	85.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-14 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	330.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	57.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	178.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	19.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	13.00

	Number of	Number of	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2017
--	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	respondent youth	respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	Data	Target	Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	57.00	330.00	18.81%	27.00%	17.27%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	235.00	330.00	65.68%	79.00%	71.21%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	267.00	330.00	77.56%	84.00%	80.91%

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Reasons for A Slippage

Based on the survey results, slight slippage was observed for the higher education outcome category. The reason for slippage in this category unclear, but Maine DOE has continued with several initiatives designed to improve transition services and promote continued education, employment, and success of individuals with disabilities in the workplace:

- Maine has engaged with the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition to provide programming entitled Translating Evidence to Support Transitions (TEST). The program delivers several curricula to support student-led post-secondary transition planning, career and technical education, and community partnerships. The Department has sponsored this work to ensure that IEPs include quality employment-focused goals, including increasing readiness for higher education, employment, and self-supportive choices.
- Maine DOE also has partnered with the Maine Medical Center and provided funding to develop transition planning training materials for school personnel, participate in family outreach events, and disseminate resources for families about the transition process.
- Additionally, Maine DOE is collaborating with the Vocational Rehabilitation division of the Maine Department of Labor to provide resources that support students' understanding of employment opportunities and training as part of transition planning.

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

At least two phone calls were attempted for all 1,226 of the former students. The total count of survey respondents was 330, yielding a response rate of 26.92%. The respondent representativeness of the overall population of exiters was assessed for Gender, Disability, Race/Ethnicity, Exit Reason, and Age and all were found to be within 5% of the population percentages.

Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school? Yes

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			30.00%	35.00%	40.00%	45.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%
Data		57.00%	50.00%	60.00%	50.00%	25.00%	20.00%	50.00%	36.36%	0%	25.00%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	58.00%	58.00%
Data		0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	58.00%	58.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-15 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	7	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
1	7	0%	58.00%	14.29%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Fewer than 10 resolution sessions were held in FFY2017. Maine is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 16: Mediation**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			77.00%	78.00%	80.00%	82.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Data		83.30%	85.00%	83.00%	86.00%	77.20%	72.55%	68.52%	66.67%	75.86%	62.00%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%
Data	71.79%	60.47%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On September 17, 2014 and November 19, 2014 the State Advisory Panel convened to review indicator baselines, discuss target trends and identify targets for B-16 from FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. The SAP is made up of gubernatorial appointees who advise the SEA on special education policy and practice, including the development of the SPP. Target data was presented to the SAP by describing trends and results of regression analyses and exponential smoothing. SAP members discussed potential root causes of performance that did not meet the targets in the previous SPP. Stakeholders made recommendations of performance targets given current and potential improvement activities. The SAP's recommendation for targets on the State Performance Plan were considered for the development of the State Performance Plan.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	28	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	10	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1 Mediations held	55	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
28	10	55	60.47%	85.00%	69.09%

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2015

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target ≥		11.22%	9.00%	16.00%	17.00%
Data	11.22%	8.92%	15.07%	8.96%	

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2018 Target

FFY	2018
Target ≥	20.00%

Key:

Description of Measure

The Maine Department of Education has chosen, as its SSIP, implementation of evidence-based professional development in the teaching of mathematics to improve the math proficiency of students with disabilities. The State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) of this initiative and the evaluation of student-level progress is as follows: Students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) will demonstrate improved math proficiency as measured by math scores on the statewide Maine Educational Assessment in the schools in which teachers receive evidence-based professional development in the teaching of math. To express proficiency as a percentage, Maine reports proficiency as follows:

Percent = number of students with IEPs in the identified schools who demonstrate proficiency in math divided by the number of students with IEPs in the identified schools who are evaluated on the math assessment.

For additional information, see the SSIP Phase III report and supporting materials attached.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See SSIP Phase III Year 3 report and supporting materials attached.

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

The data and analyses used to formulate the FFY 2014 revised SIMR and associated improvement strategies are the same as those documented in Phase I of the SSIP (see Phase I data analysis).

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

See Phase I for initial infrastructure analysis. Further developments and improvements of infrastructure are described in Component 1 of the SSIP Phase II write-up.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

State-Identified Measurable Result - Students with IEPs in grades 3–8 will demonstrate improved math proficiency as measured by math scores on the state assessment in the subset of schools in which teachers participate in a research based professional development program that aims to improve math content knowledge and pedagogy.

Description of Measure – Students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) in grades 3–8 will demonstrate improved math proficiency as measured by math scores on the state assessment in the subset of schools in which teachers receive evidence-based professional development in the teaching of math. To express proficiency as a percentage, Maine reports the percent of grade 3–8 students with IEPs in identified schools who demonstrate proficiency in math on the statewide assessment:

Percent = number of grade 3–8 students with IEPs in the identified schools who demonstrate proficiency in math divided by the number of grade 3–8 students with IEPs in the identified schools who are evaluated on the math assessment.

Additionally, to identify potential improvement in math test scores that is not accompanied by a crossing of the score boundaries that define the proficiency categories, Maine will track student growth in the identified schools by assessing yearly changes in students' scaled scores on the statewide math assessment.

Description

With stakeholder input, Maine's State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) and associated improvement strategies were revised in FFY 2014. Unlike the SIMR identified in Phase I, which focused on the math proficiency of students with disabilities in schools with specified achievement gaps between students with disabilities and their general education peers, the revised SIMR focuses on the math proficiency of students with disabilities in schools in which teachers volunteer to take part in a specific professional development program that aims to improve math content knowledge and pedagogy. Maine DOE and Maine's SSIP stakeholder group discussed the revised SIMR and associated improvement strategies in the fall of 2015, and all members expressed a great deal of support. The professional development program that will serve as the primary improvement strategy for achieving the SIMR is discussed in Component 2 of the SSIP Phase II write-up. The Theory of Action and Logic Model that correspond to the revised SIMR are attached to the SSIP Phase II write-up.

Description of Measure – Students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) in grades 3–8 will demonstrate improved math proficiency as measured by math scores on the state assessment in the subset of schools in which teachers receive evidence-based professional development in the teaching of math. To express proficiency as a percentage, Maine reports the percent of grade 3–8 students with IEPs in identified schools who demonstrate proficiency in math on the statewide assessment:

Percent = number of grade 3–8 students with IEPs in the identified schools who demonstrate proficiency in math divided by the number of grade 3–8 students with IEPs in the identified schools who are evaluated on the math assessment.

Additionally, to identify potential improvement in math test scores that is not accompanied by a crossing of the score boundaries that define the proficiency categories, Maine will track student growth in the identified schools by assessing yearly changes in students' scaled scores on the statewide math assessment.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

With stakeholder input, Maine's State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) and associated improvement strategies were revised in FFY 2014. Unlike the SIMR identified in Phase I, which focused on the math proficiency of students with disabilities in schools with specified achievement gaps between students with disabilities and their general education peers, the revised SIMR focuses on the math proficiency of students with disabilities in schools in which teachers volunteer to take part in a specific professional development program that aims to improve math content knowledge and pedagogy. Maine DOE and Maine's SSIP stakeholder group discussed the revised SIMR and associated improvement strategies in the fall of 2015, and all members expressed a great deal of support. The professional development program that will serve as the primary improvement strategy for achieving the SIMR is discussed in Component 2 of the SSIP Phase II write-up. Additionally, the Theory of Action and Logic Model that correspond to the revised SIMR are attached to the SSIP Phase II write-up.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted
5/28/2019

 Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

(1a) Improvements to State Infrastructure. The analysis conducted as part of Phase I of Maine's SSIP identified a number of infrastructure elements that could be developed or further aligned with SSIP activities to support LEAs in implementing and sustaining evidence-based practices in the teaching of math. Building on that initial analysis, Maine plans to build capacity, expertise, and sustainability by leveraging and further developing the following infrastructure components:

- **Financial Support** – The primary financial resource that Maine DOE plans to leverage to support the Math4ME training, post-training fidelity assessments and coaching in LEAs, and long-term scale-up is the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG), implemented by the Maine DOE Office of Special Services. SPDG funding will pay for expert trainers to provide professional development to participating teachers and provide advanced training to Teacher-Leaders, described below. Additionally, SPDG funds will provide up to \$10,000 to each school to cover miscellaneous costs associated with their teachers' participation in the project (e.g. cost of substitutes, travel, materials). The SPDG budget also provides funds over the course of 5 years for scale-up of the initiative to additional LEAs in different regions of Maine.
- **Foundations of Math Trainers** – Maine DOE will contract with the two developers of the Foundations of Math training to provide training to special education and general education teachers in participating LEAs. The trainers will also provide advanced training on fidelity of practice to Teacher-Leaders.
- **Teacher-Leaders** – Maine DOE will contract with one LEA in each year's cohort of participating LEAs to provide a teacher to serve as Teacher-Leader for the cohort. Maine DOE will provide the LEA with the amount of the teacher's salary, benefits, and miscellaneous costs to allow the teacher to be available for the Math4ME initiative. The Teacher-Leader will receive advanced training on fidelity of practice of the Foundations of Math program and will be responsible for fidelity observations, coaching of the trained teachers in the LEA cohort, and coordination of data collections necessary to evaluate program effectiveness for the cohort. Teacher-Leaders also will assist with scale-up and expansion of expertise and capacity in other Maine LEAs.
- **Math Content Specialist** – The Maine DOE Learning Systems Team recently hired a math content specialist specifically for elementary grade levels. This individual will participate in the initial Math4ME training and will join the SSIP Workgroup described below. Inclusion of the math content specialist in the Workgroup promises to offer a unique, math-specific perspective for evaluating the implementation and effectiveness of the professional development.
- **General Supervision System** – Monitoring of public school special education programs occurs as part of the general supervision system. Monitoring has historically focused on compliance issues, but Maine DOE has committed to the transformation of its general supervision system into one that looks at student outcomes such as proficiency in addition to compliance elements. Working toward this shift in focus to student outcomes, Maine currently participates in the TA&D Network Results-Based Accountability Cross-State Learning Collaborative to learn about other states' approaches to crafting results-driven monitoring systems. The inclusion of student outcomes in LEA assessments will inform placement of each LEA on a tiered system of supports that will address either compliance and/or the improvement of student outcomes. The inclusion of student outcomes in these assessments is a significant change in infrastructure that will inform and be informed by the work of the SSIP.
- **Communication Network** – Maine DOE communicates with educators and the public via weekly Commissioner's Updates. These emails originate from the Maine DOE newsroom and inform members of the listserv on current events within the Maine DOE and the field of education more generally as it relates to Maine. All professional development opportunities sponsored by or provided through the Maine DOE are posted on the Maine DOE Professional Development Calendar. These resources offer, among other things, evidence-based tools with instructions for use, recorded trainings accessible at any time, and live trainings to attend in areas of need or interest. Maine's communication network will be leveraged to publicize activities related to the Math4ME initiative. Additionally, to reach parents who might not be aware of Maine DOE's existing communication tools, Maine DOE will contract with the Maine Parent Federation to offer periodic informational presentations to parents regarding SSIP activities and the impact of those activities on students in general and special education.
- **Program Evaluation** – The Maine Education Policy Research Institute (MEPRI), housed at the University of Maine, has been contracted to conduct the external evaluation of the SSIP. For two decades, MEPRI has provided research, program evaluation, and policy analysis to Maine schools, agencies, and community organizations, as well as other university and community-based researchers. MEPRI researchers have expertise in quantitative and qualitative methods in addition to data collection and survey and instrument design.
- **Teacher Preparation** – The University of Maine system is the primary provider of preservice training for Maine's teachers. Teachers also use University of Maine system courses and workshops to further develop their skills and to pursue advanced degrees. Maine DOE has engaged education faculty members at the University of Maine who have expressed an interest in partnering to integrate components of the Foundations of Math training into the curriculum of education majors. Incorporation of such components promises to have a far-reaching effect in sustaining evidence-based practices in the teaching of math across Maine.

(1b) Alignment of the SSIP Initiative with Other Improvement Programs. Maine's SSIP aligns with some of the most important and far-reaching of Maine DOE's initiatives – the Focus School/Priority School program and Proficiency-Based Diplomas.

- **Focus Schools/Priority Schools** – The Maine DOE School Improvement Team works with two categories of schools: (1) Focus Schools have the greatest gaps in proficiency between subgroups of students (e.g. students with disabilities compared to the entire school population) and (2) Priority Schools have low overall proficiency for the entire school population. Maine's differentiated accountability system identifies the professional development available to all schools, including those that do not fall into the priority and focus school categories but are eligible for Title I funding. Focus Schools receive coaching support using the Indistar system of leadership development. Coaches facilitate LEAs' self-assessments and use of data for effective improvement planning and implementation. The focus school/priority school coaches have been well represented in the development of the SSIP and will continue to consult with the SSIP Workgroup. Two of the schools selected in the initial Math4ME cohort are focus schools, and the focus school coach will work in collaboration with the Math4ME Teacher-Leaders to enhance both initiatives.
- **Proficiency Based Diplomas** – Title 20-A, Part 3, Chapter 207-A, Subchapter 3, Section 4722- A requires that all Maine students will meet standards in eight content areas to receive a high school diploma beginning in 2018. Work in this area addresses the shift to demonstration of proficiency in content standards, putting achievement of standards behind the diploma. Content specialists are supporting schools in the implementation of the revised Maine Learning Results which incorporate the Common Core State Standards for mathematics and English language arts. The Special Services General Education/Special Education Liaison supports the content specialists and schools in universal designs for learning, multiple pathways for demonstration of proficiency, and standards-aligned IEP goal development. Many LEAs have applied for and been awarded extensions to the proficiency based diploma as far out as 2020-21. Substantial professional development regarding proficiency-based education has been offered to support LEAs in their implementation of the laws. The Math4ME project is an important professional development activity that will help all educators serving student with disabilities acquire the content knowledge and skills necessary to support math proficiency for all students.

(1c) SSIP Administration and Resources. A cross-division SSIP Workgroup has been created at Maine DOE to translate the ideas that arise in discussions with stakeholders, technical assistance personnel, evaluators, trainers, and others into suggestions and formulate decision points regarding the SSIP and to forge linkages between initiatives across DOE divisions. The workgroup represents a variety of perspectives and divisions across Maine DOE and consists of the Maine DOE Special Education Director, the SSIP Coordinator, the Federal Programs Coordinator, the Special Purpose Private School Coordinator, the General Education/Special Education Liaison, and the IDEA Part B Data Manager. Moving forward, Maine DOE's newly-hired elementary-school math content expert will also join the workgroup. The group will meet regularly to assess implementation progress, evaluate outcomes, and discuss ways in which Maine DOE and other state agencies can best support LEAs in the development, scale-up, and sustained implementation of evidence-based practices in the teaching of math.

Additionally, Maine DOE personnel, including members of the SSIP Workgroup, will continue to meet with the full stakeholder group throughout the length of the SSIP. These meetings will be used to examine implementation progress, evaluate data available from formative and summative assessments, solicit stakeholder feedback, and address ad-hoc issues and implementation barriers. An important function of the group will be to proactively advise on the acquisition of resources necessary to engage each new LEA cohort. Resource and timeline considerations will involve yearly solicitation of applications from LEAs wishing to participate in the professional development, contracting with LEAs for new Teacher-Leaders, and contracting with trainers. The inclusion of the SSIP initiative as one of the SPDG-funded professional development goals is a substantial benefit for the acquisition of SSIP resources. Maine has budgeted SPDG funds to ensure that SSIP-related contracts with LEAs, trainers, and external evaluators can be funded through 2020. Sustainability of evidence-based practices in the teaching of math beyond the SPDG-funded time-frame will include the integration of Math4ME professional development elements into teacher preparation programs at the University of Maine System.

(1d) Involvement of Multiple Offices and Agencies. Maine DOE divisions have significantly increased their collaborations over the past several years, creating overlap and cross-team activities. It is clear that the working relationships within Maine DOE have been changing to include more frequent conversation and collaboration to assist LEAs in their work with students with and without disabilities. For example, the Office of Special Services

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

has worked closely with the math specialists on Maine DOE's Learning Systems Team in the development of the SSIP and will further engage Maine DOE's general education partners by consulting with the newly-hired elementary-school math content specialist. Additionally, the General Education/Special Education Liaison, a member of the SSIP Workgroup, will continue to attend regular meetings of the Learning Systems Team to facilitate the exchange of ideas and collaborate on work that benefits all Maine students.

Additionally, Maine DOE's Focus and Priority School program administrators and coaches will play a significant role in the implementation and evaluation of the model of coaching and fidelity assessment that will be used for the Math4ME initiative. The relevant areas for improvement within and across the systems include an aligned practice of coaching that is targeted specifically to the needs of special education teachers and general education teachers as they relate to the instruction of students with disabilities. Students receiving special education are general education students first, and their general education teachers require knowledge of inclusive teaching strategies to successfully educate these students in their classrooms to the fullest extent possible. Additionally, special education teachers are in need of instructional strategies for math that exploit areas of strength and support areas of need. Coaching is an evidence-based training practice that has been shown to have the highest training outcomes for knowledge of content, skill implementation, and classroom application when paired with administrative support and data feedback (Joyce & Showers, 2002). As such, Maine DOE is committed to a coaching model that supports inclusive teaching strategies for general educators and increasing understanding of effective math instructional practices by special educators.

Summary: The relative areas of strength within and across systems include general education and special education initiatives and activities that have been increasingly aligned. The increased communication and collaboration of teams embodies multiple reform initiatives addressing all students, including students with disabilities. Maine's ongoing implementation of proficiency-based education initiatives, differentiated accountability systems of supports, educator effectiveness initiatives, and other educational reforms cannot occur with teams working on their own. Cross-collaboration and cross-communication between and among teams ensure all students are considered as general education students first, and the professional development activities currently offered, even when focused on students with disabilities, have intended outcomes for all students. Supports that teachers and educational leaders need to meet high expectations for all students are provided in multiple ways and are communicated to the field on a regular basis.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

(2a) Implementation Support for LEAs. With stakeholder input, the Maine Department of Education (DOE) has chosen to implement an evidence-based professional development program in the teaching of foundations of math (Math4ME) in selected schools as its primary SSIP improvement strategy.

In the summer of 2015, Maine DOE began investigating published research on the Foundations of Math professional development program and discussed its empirical basis with two developers of the program: Chris Cain, an Associate Professor of Education at Mars Hill University, and Valerie Faulkner, an Assistant Professor of Education at North Carolina State University. Maine DOE personnel also discussed the program's promise with Maine's stakeholder group, whose members expressed a high level of support, and with federally-contracted technical assistance personnel, including Mary Watson, a former Special Education Director in North Carolina, a state that had already seen a great deal of success as a result of the program. A significant portion of the Foundations of Math training focuses on components of number sense: 1) Algebraic and Geometric Thinking, 2) Quantity/Magnitude, 3) Numeration, 4) Equality, 5) Base Ten, 6) Form of a Number, and 7) Proportional Reasoning (Cain, Doggett, Faulkner, & Hale, 2007). These content components are integrated with evidence-based teaching practices to increase the conceptual coherence of math instruction, and there is evidence that the training increases teachers' knowledge of math content and pedagogy and that students have benefited from receiving math instruction from teachers who have received the training (Faulkner, Cain, Hale, & Doggett, 2006; Faulkner & Cain, 2013). For example, comparing end-of-grade math assessments, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction verified that students with disabilities who were taught by teachers who participated in the training made greater gains than students with disabilities who were taught by teachers who had not participated in the training (see Attachment 2).

After obtaining consensus with stakeholders on the value of implementing the professional development program in Maine, Maine DOE contracted with two developers of the program, Chris Cain and Valerie Faulker, to provide the training to teachers of math at selected schools. Schools were selected using a competitive application process. Maine DOE advertised the opportunity to participate in the Math4ME training to all public LEAs in Maine, and the selection of LEAs was based on their responses to the application questions (see Attachment 3 for application rubric). In their applications, LEAs described how their needs fit with the professional development, and they addressed their readiness and capacity to institute evidence-based improvement practices in their schools. Specifically, Maine DOE's selection of LEAs was based on evaluation of the following factors, which LEAs addressed in their applications:

- Rationale/description of need for the professional development
- Readiness to implement improvement practices, including support for ongoing coaching of teachers after initial training
- Leadership structure and infrastructure available to sustain the improvement strategies
- Evidence of collaboration between special education and regular education teachers, including a description of how special education and regular education teachers will continue to collaborate for long-term implementation of the improvement strategies.

Based on these criteria, in the fall of 2015 Maine DOE selected 5 schools spanning the school districts of Auburn, Lewiston, MSAD 52, and the Auburn site of the Margaret Murphy Centers for Children (a special purpose private school) as the first cohort of schools to engage in the training. In addition to strong valuation of the LEAs' readiness, leadership, needs, and the other factors that influenced selection, the selected LEAs are geographically adjacent in a relatively urban area, and there is a high degree of student transience between them. Therefore, students transferring between the schools of the selected LEAs would be more likely to receive consistent math instruction.

The Math4ME training will begin in the summer of 2016 with five days of on-site training and outside reading covering math content and evidence-based practices in the teaching of math. Participants will be volunteer special education teachers and volunteer regular education teachers from the selected LEAs. The expected number of participants in this training is 4–7 teachers from each of the 5 selected schools for a total of 20–35 participants. As mentioned above, a significant portion of the training focuses on number sense, and the content components are integrated with evidence-based teaching practices designed to increase the conceptual coherence of math instruction.

After training, Maine DOE will support the LEAs to ensure continuous implementation and fidelity of practice in several ways. Maine DOE will contract with one of the LEAs to provide a teacher who will assume the position of Teacher-Leader. This individual will receive additional training on the fidelity of practice of the Math4ME program and will be responsible for fidelity observations and coaching of the trained teachers across all selected LEAs. The Teacher-Leader will also coordinate the data collections necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of the program for the LEA cohort. Additionally, Maine DOE will contract with the University of Maine to provide external evaluators for the project. The evaluators will create data-collection instruments, conduct teacher interviews, and engage in other evaluation activities (see the Evaluation Section, Component 3 of this document). Collaboratively, the University of Maine evaluators, Maine DOE, and the Teacher-Leader will coordinate fidelity of practice assessments, formative evaluations of student progress, and teacher interviews throughout the school-year. Additionally, end-of-grade math assessments will be evaluated at the end of the school year. Evaluation will be ongoing for the initial cohort of students of trained teachers (e.g., following student math performance in the years that follow), and plans for scale-up include training the majority of teachers of math (both general educators and special educators) in the selected LEAs. During scale-up, LEAs will continue to receive the same supports that were provided during the first year of the program.

Given that favorable results are seen for the first cohort of LEAs, Maine DOE envisions that long-term scale-up will include delivery of the Math4ME training to other LEAs across the state. Additionally, pending evaluation of the program's effectiveness, education faculty members from the Farmington and Orono campuses of the University of Maine have expressed an interest in partnering with Maine DOE in scale-up activities that include integrating components of the training into the course curriculum for education majors at the University of Maine.

(2b) Implementation Timelines and Improvement Strategies. Maine's stakeholders have contributed consistently and substantially to the interpretation of data analyses, infrastructure analyses, selection and modification of the SIMR, and the form and direction of the implementation plan more generally. The goal for each stakeholder meeting has been to work as partners toward an intended outcome. In some cases the purpose of the meeting was to brainstorm and share perspectives. In others, the intent was to reach consensus on a general course of action or specific activities. In each case, Maine DOE personnel and technical assistance personnel presented information and facilitated discussion, and members of the stakeholder group partnered with Maine DOE personnel to make decisions. From these meetings, Maine stakeholders and Maine DOE have agreed to the following improvement activities, roles, goals, and timelines for first-year implementation:

- **Implementation Activity 1: Math4ME Training of Initial Cohort of Teachers**
Short-Term Timeline: 5 days of training; completed during summer, 2016
Coordinator/Facilitator: Chris Cain and Valerie Faulkner
Participants: 4–7 teachers from each of the 5 selected schools for a total of 20–35 participants.
Resources: State/IDEA funds
Assessment of Fidelity: Pre-training–Post-training to assess changes in teachers' knowledge of math content and pedagogy.
Long-Term Timeline/Scale-up: Training of additional teacher cohorts and Teacher-Leaders.

- **Implementation Activity 2: Fidelity Training for Teacher-Leader**
Short-Term Timeline: Completed during summer, 2016
Coordinator/Facilitator: Chris Cain and Valerie Faulkner
Participants: One individual from one of the 5 selected schools.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Resources: State/IDEA funds

Assessment of Fidelity: Post-Training assessment on fidelity of practice

Long-Term Timeline/Scale-up Activities: Obtain Teacher-Leader for each new cohort of LEAs trained

• Implementation Activity 3: Fidelity Checks/Coaching of Trained Teachers

Short-Term Timeline: 3 coaching visits during the 2016-17 school year for each trained teacher

Coordinator/Facilitator: Teacher-Leader

Participants: Each trained teacher will be coached

Resources: State/IDEA funds

Assessment of Fidelity: Fidelity evaluations will be completed by the Teacher-Leader

Long-Term Timeline/Scale-up Activities: 3 coaching visits per year for trained teachers in subsequent cohorts

Maine DOE will continue to schedule meetings with the full stakeholder group as appropriate throughout the length of the SSIP. These meetings will be used to report implementation progress, evaluate data available from formative and summative assessments, solicit feedback from stakeholders, and address any ad-hoc issues and implementation barriers. In addition to the full meetings, members of the stakeholder group may join smaller more content-specific groups that will communicate more frequently in person or by email to discuss specific areas of interest. Additionally, an SSIP Implementation Leader from Maine DOE will be responsible for providing updates to stakeholders, evaluators, and all interested persons via an emailed newsletter, and the person will serve as a point of contact for communicating needs, concerns, and updates between the LEA Teacher-Leader, the external evaluators, members of the stakeholder group, and other Maine DOE personnel.

(2c) Resources and Stewardship for Sustained Implementation. The Maine DOE SSIP Workgroup was developed to translate the ideas that arise in discussions with stakeholders, technical assistance personnel, evaluators, trainers, and others into suggestions and formulate decision points regarding the improvement plan. The workgroup consists of the State Special Education Director, the SSIP Coordinator, the Federal Programs Coordinator, the Special Purpose Private School Coordinator, the General Education/Special Education Liaison, and the IDEA Part B Data Manager. The Regular Education/Special Education Liaison was hired by the Special Services division of Maine DOE to engage in activities of Maine DOE's Learning Systems Teams and the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) initiatives that support scale-up and sustained implementation of evidence-based practices. The Learning Systems Team includes the Standards and Instructional Support Team and the School Improvement Team, and these teams participate in initiatives that cross divisions within Maine DOE. The Learning Systems Team includes a newly-hired math specialist for elementary grade levels, and this individual will be invited to participate in the initial Math4ME training as an introduction to the SSIP work. The SSIP Workgroup and Learning Systems Team members will meet regularly to discuss the ways in which Maine DOE and other state agencies can best support LEAs in scale-up and sustained implementation of evidence-based practices, including the Math4ME initiative.

Additionally, the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) submitted for the next competitive grant cycle includes a goal focused on state capacity-building and scale-up for evidence-based math instruction. In the application, SPDG funding has been budgeted to support Math4ME training for additional teachers and Teacher-Leaders, ongoing coaching and fidelity assessments, evaluations of program effectiveness, and other activities that support the SSIP through 2020. State/IDEA funds also will be used to maintain external evaluation by the University of Maine for scale-up activities that take place between the first year of Math4ME training and 2018.

Maine also has engaged education faculty members at the University of Maine who have expressed an interest in partnering with Maine DOE to integrate components of the Math4ME training into the curriculum of education majors at the University of Maine, which will have a far-reaching influence in sustaining evidence-based practices in the teaching of math across Maine. To facilitate this partnership and efforts to improve teacher per-service preparation for teaching math to students with disabilities, the Maine DOE SSIP Workgroup will invite a representative from the Standards and Instructional Support team within Maine DOE to serve on the SSIP Workgroup and work with the stakeholders.

Evaluation

(a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

(b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.

(c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).

(d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

(3a) Evaluation Objectives and Components. The development of Maine's evaluation plan was guided by the theory of action (Attachment 4) and the objectives outlined in the SSIP logic model (Attachment 5). The theory of action and logic model outline a pathway to sustainable evidence-based math instruction to improve math proficiency for students with disabilities in Maine. The evaluation elements aligned with implementation activities are noted in the Implementation section (Component 2) of this document. The following evaluation activities are aligned to each of the outcomes/objectives listed in the logic model:

• Outcome 1 (short-term): Increased knowledge of fundamental math content and pedagogy for Teacher Leader. Data/Evaluation of Progress: The Teacher-Leader will demonstrate increased knowledge of math content and evidence-based pedagogy as measured by pre- and post-training assessments developed by the external evaluator.

• Outcome 2 (short-term): Increased knowledge of fundamental math content and pedagogy for trained teachers. Data/Evaluation of Progress: The teachers who participate in training will demonstrate increased knowledge of math content and evidence-based pedagogy as measured by pre- and post-training assessments developed by the external evaluator.

• Outcome 3 (Medium-term): Increased skill of trained teachers in utilizing evidence-based practices in the teaching of math. Data/Evaluation of Progress: The Teacher-Leader will conduct 2 to 3 fidelity observations/coaching with each trained teacher during the course of the school year following the teachers' training. The rubric used for fidelity evaluations will be designed by external evaluators at the University of Maine in collaboration with the trainers/developers of the professional development and the Teacher-Leader. Additionally, each teacher will be interviewed by an external evaluator from the University of Maine at least once during the school year to assess the degree to which teachers feel their practices have improved and to gauge teachers' assessments of the benefits of the training and fidelity observations/coaching.

• Outcome 4 (Medium-term): Increased number of students with disabilities exposed to evidence-based teaching practices regarding fundamental concepts in math. Data/Evaluation of Progress: Maine DOE will monitor the number of teachers trained from the initial cohort through scale-up with subsequent cohorts.

- o The goal for year 1 of the initial cohort is to train 50% of the special education teachers and 8% of the regular education teachers in the selected schools, for a total of 22 teachers.
- o The goal for year 2 of the initial cohort is to train at least 20 new teachers in the selected schools such that 90% of the special education teachers and 16% of the regular education teachers are trained by the end of year 2.
- o The year 3 goal is a scale-up of the initiative beyond the initial cohort. The new cohort will consist of 5 new schools in new LEAs. For the new cohort, the year 1 and year 2 goals for the number of teachers trained will be the same as the year 1 and year 2 goals of the first cohort.

Progress toward these goals will be monitored and, with stakeholder input, targets will be adjusted when appropriate. Additionally, the Teacher-Leader will provide Maine DOE and the external evaluators with counts of the number of students being taught by teachers who received the math training each year.

• Outcome 5 (Long-term): Increased proficiency in math for elementary-aged students with disabilities in the selected LEAs. Data/Evaluation of Progress: Progress toward improved math proficiency of students in the selected LEAs will be formatively assessed by teachers during the course of each school year. Because formative assessments of students at one LEA may differ from formative assessments of students at other LEAs, it will be essential to consider student performance in the context of the specific school and teacher. Therefore, analysis of formative performance data will be informed by input from the teachers; teacher interviews by external evaluators will serve to gather teacher input and contextual information, and they will also provide an opportunity to illuminate outcomes that would not be discernable from performance assessments alone (e.g., changes in students' enthusiasm for math, completion of homework). Summative assessments will consist of the math section of end-of-grade statewide assessments. Additionally, external evaluators from the University of Maine will conduct surveys of the parents of children taught by the trained teachers to track potential improvements in the students' attitudes toward math and other potential outcomes that would not be captured by examination scores alone.

As described above, Maine DOE's plan for scale-up beyond the initial cohort consists of increasing the number of trained teachers in additional LEAs and, as a corollary, increasing the number of students receiving evidence-based math instruction. Scale-up will also consist of the training of additional Teacher-Leaders to perform fidelity assessments and coaching of trained teachers at participating LEAs.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

(3b) Stakeholder Involvement in Evaluation. Stakeholders have been integral in the selection of the evaluation activities listed above and will continue to be involved in the evaluation of progress toward all goals of the initiative. In a stakeholder meeting held on October 22, 2015, stakeholders considered the proposed changes to the SIMR and improvement activities and were very supportive of the changes. Additionally, in the October, 2015 meeting and a meeting held on January 28, 2016, stakeholders and Maine DOE collaborated to align the theory of action and logic model with the new improvement activities. In both of these meetings, stakeholders also suggested activities that they believed would be essential for promoting the initiative. These suggestions included engaging the Maine Parent Federation to offer informational sessions for families and teachers at the selected LEAs, distributing newsletters with progress updates for stakeholders, teachers, and parents, holding a publicized 'kick-off' of the initiative, and engaging in celebrations of success with the LEAs.

Additionally, stakeholders suggested evaluation elements that they thought were essential to monitoring the initiative. These suggestions included formative and summative assessments of students' math knowledge, feedback from teachers regarding their use of new pedagogical strategies and techniques in the classroom and their perceptions of students' responses to those techniques, parent feedback and perceptions of their children regarding changes in attitudes toward math, changes in students' completion of math homework, and other outcomes that would not be discernable from assessments alone.

The Maine DOE will continue to update stakeholders on implementation progress and emerging evaluation data and will schedule meetings through 2017 as appropriate. Additionally, members of the stakeholder group have been asked to indicate if they are interested in creating smaller committees that would address more specific topics or activities. For example, some members have indicated that they would be particularly interested in being involved in the planning and monitoring of activities associated with public promotion and dissemination of information about the initiative, others expressed a specific interest in evaluation activities. Therefore, we expect that, in addition to meetings of the full stakeholder group, content-specific stakeholder committees and Maine DOE personnel will communicate regularly via email and ad-hoc meetings.

(3c) Data Collection and Analysis. Stakeholders, Maine DOE personnel and external evaluators from the University of Maine discussed and agreed on the advantages of gathering within-school-year formative and end-of-grade summative data based on quantitative assessments of students' math knowledge and qualitative data on student outcomes that are not discernable from assessment scores alone. Formative assessments of students' math knowledge will be conducted periodically throughout the school year, and the data will be collected by the Teacher-Leader and submitted to the University of Maine external evaluators for analysis. Because formative assessments of students at one LEA may differ from formative assessments of students at other LEAs, it will be essential to consider student performance in the context of the specific school and teacher. Therefore, analysis of formative performance data will be informed by input from the teachers; teacher interviews by external evaluators will serve to gather teacher input and contextual information, and they will also provide an opportunity to illuminate outcomes that would not be discernable from performance assessments alone (e.g., changes in students' enthusiasm for math, completion of homework).

All student-level data, including assessment scores used for proficiency calculations, are entered and maintained in the State Student Information System. The Maine DOE Special Services Data Manager will de-identify the end-of-grade math performance data, other than student number, which would be required for tracking students across grades, and submit the data to the external evaluators for analysis. In the data submission, the Data Manager will indicate the students with disabilities who received math instruction from the trained teachers so comparisons can be made between these students and those in the same LEA who received instruction from teachers that did not participate in the training. Additional analyses will examine the proficiency percentages and average scaled scores of students with disabilities who received math instruction from the trained teachers as compared to all other LEA proficiency percentages and scaled scores of students with disabilities across the state. In addition to the end-of-year comparisons, the proficiency categories and scaled scores of students of trained teachers will be followed across grade levels in subsequent years and comparisons will be made between these students' scores and those of other students with disabilities in the same grades across the state.

(3d) Evaluating Progress Toward the SIMR. Formative and summative data regarding the success of implementation activities and progress toward the SIMR will be reviewed by external evaluators as it becomes available. External evaluators will share their analyses with the Maine DOE SSIP Workgroup, and with stakeholders in face-to-face meetings and periodic newsletters. Evaluation data will also be presented and discussed in meetings of the subgroup of stakeholders comprising the evaluation committee. Suggestions and concerns that arise from such discussions will be communicated to the full stakeholder group. Progress toward implementation goals and the SIMR will be assessed using the criteria outlined in Section (3a) above and will be communicated to stakeholders in meetings and newsletters. Based on assessments of implementation and progress toward the SIMR, decisions regarding modifications to implementation or evaluation activities, timelines, and goals will be made by the Maine DOE SSIP Workgroup as informed by suggestions solicited from the full stakeholder group and the external evaluators.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Maine has benefitted greatly from the assistance provided by multiple OSEP-funded technical assistance agencies. Personnel from the IDEA Data Center and the National Center for Systemic Improvement have provided indispensable guidance, consultation, and coordination through all steps of Maine's development of the SSIP, and Maine will continue to benefit greatly from their assistance. Moving forward to Phase III, consultation on continued stakeholder engagement, infrastructure development, alignment of resources, and technical assistance regarding implementation science and best-practices for scale-up will be particularly valuable. Additionally, Maine hopes to continue to draw on the experience of technical assistance personnel who have administered or consulted in the service of similar initiatives for systemic change in other states, particularly as those experiences relate to addressing potential implementation barriers.

At this time, the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) is the primary financial resource that Maine DOE plans to leverage to support the Math4ME training, post-training fidelity assessments and coaching in LEAs, evaluation of outcomes, and long-term scale-up. However, because the SPDG is a competitive grant that supports diverse initiatives beyond the SSIP, support from OSEP in the form of a non-competitive grant targeted specifically for SSIP implementation and scale-up would be a great benefit. The assurance of SSIP funding would assist with long-term planning for capacity-building and scale-up.

Additionally, stakeholder assistance and support has been and will continue to be crucial to the success of the SSIP. Maine DOE will continue to meet with the full stakeholder group to examine implementation progress, evaluate data available from formative and summative assessments, solicit stakeholder feedback, and address ad-hoc issues and implementation barriers. An important function of the group will be to proactively advise on how to engage and garner support from the field—teachers, administrators, students, and parents—in each new LEA cohort, broadcast successes, and build interest and enthusiasm for the initiative across the state.

Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SIMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

See SSIP Phase III Year 3 report and supporting materials attached.

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

See SSIP Phase III Year 3 report and supporting materials attached.

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SIMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SIMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

See SSIP Phase III Year 3 report and supporting materials attached.

D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SIMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

See SSIP Phase III Year 3 report and supporting materials attached.

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SIMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SIMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SIMR in relation to targets

See SSIP Phase III Year 3 report and supporting materials attached.

F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

See SSIP Phase III Year 3 report and supporting materials attached.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name: Janice Breton

Title: State Director of Special Services Birth - 20

Email: janice.breton@maine.gov

Phone: 207-624-6676