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# Introduction

**Instructions**

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State’s systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State’s General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

The Maine Department of Education (Maine DOE) Office of Special Services and Child Development Services (CDS) implement the birth to twenty (B-20) General Supervision System to manage and oversee all aspects of effective implementation and integrated monitoring activities pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Maine has extended its General Supervision to include education through the 22nd birthday as rulemaking is established regarding the administrative letter found here: https://mainedoenews.net/2021/01/21/administrative-letter-change-in-the-ending-age-for-special-education-eligibility-effective-immediately/ .
Evaluations and interventions of Local Education Agencies (LEAs) 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, 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 the development and implementation of improvement strategies to address identified needs.
Maine DOE 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 LEA in the state. Integrated on-site and off-site monitoring activities ensure Maine's capacity to identify and correct noncompliance and facilitate improved performance. Additionally, Maine DOE provides technical assistance, professional development, and a variety of resources with the purpose of developing supports that are accessible to LEAs and stakeholders around the state. The Introduction sections below address Maine's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance, Professional Development, Stakeholder Involvement, and Public Reporting.

**Additional information related to data collection and reporting**

In addition to data collected from each LEA through a statewide data system, APR data are also collected through monitoring activities. Based on data from both sources, 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. The profiles provide indicator-specific 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. The indicators are evaluated for level of determination to provide the LEA with measurement-specific feedback on their implementation of IDEA.
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).

**Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year**

252

**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). An SAU is a 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 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 through 21 as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and is overseen by the federal Office of Special Education Programs.
GSS assumes the following responsibilities:
State Performance Plan (SPP): The SPP is an accountability mechanism for the State and Maine SAUs. It provides measurable indication of Maine's performance in specific statutory priority areas of IDEA. Maine Department of Education (DOE) is responsible for the SPP.

Special Education is governed by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and is defined as “specially designed instruction, at no cost to parents, to meet the unique needs of a child with a disability”. In Maine, the rule chapter that is specific to the education of children with disabilities is Maine Department of Education Regulations, Chapter 101, Maine Unified Special Education Regulation Birth to Age Twenty (MUSER).
The MUSER Summary states the following:
“SUMMARY: This rule governs the administration of the child find system for children age birth to twenty, the provision of early intervention services to eligible children birth to under age 3 (B-2) with disabilities and their families, and the provision of special education and related services to eligible children age three to twenty with disabilities and their families, implementing 20-A MRSA Chapters 301, and 303 and amendments thereto.”
An Administrative Letter outlining a change in the ending age for special education eligibility was issued January 21, 2021 and stated that Maine will implement the “federal standard” and provide FAPE to eligible students until their 22nd birthday. The administrative letter is located at the following url: https://mainedoenews.net/2021/01/21/administrative-letter-change-in-the-ending-age-for-special-education-eligibility-effective-immediately/
To address this change, as well as to streamline other components of MUSER, the Special Services Team at Maine DOE is working to review and rewrite MUSER. However, any amendments to MUSER have been put on pause until the next Legislative Session.
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).
Integrated Monitoring Activities: 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.
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 are available on the following webpage: https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed.
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. 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.

**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 Department of Education and Child Development Services (CDS) provide a range of technical assistance, from minimal assistance to substantial interventions, to improve performance. 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 and from other resources.
Maine DOE and CDS have several mechanisms in place to ensure high quality, evidence-based practices and support to LEAs occurs in a timely manner. Structures that exist within the Office of Special Services and CDS connect technical assistance and professional development initiatives across the Department of Education and through National TA Centers to provide collaborative technical assistance.
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 LEA's regarding current issues and offers guidance in a publication called the Maine DOE Update.
In an effort to maintain support to the field, the Special Services team offered regularly scheduled Office Hours from 9/8/20 through 6/24/21. During each session, the team shared the following information:
- Corresponding PowerPoint
- Procedural Manual
- Maine Unified Special Education Regulations (MUSER)
The second Wednesday of each month was dedicated to specific topics, which were designed and organized prior to September, and the schedule, with all the topics, was presented to the field prior to their start. The last Friday of each month was an open Q&A session, where the Supervision and Monitoring Team were available to respond to questions from the field.
Special Services also offered consistent technical assistance via daily phone duty with a team member. This occurred on a rotating schedule, and each member of the team was available to respond to questions, concerns etc. from any constituent, including, but not limited to, school staff, parents, special education directors, consultants, related service providers, community members and/or others.
The topic-specific sessions lasted approximately 45-60 minutes and all participants were offered a certificate of attendance. Office hours were recorded and the link to these archived trainings is: https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed/covid19/Administrators/Virtual%20Meeting%20Archives
ECETA Trainings have also been offered during 2020-21. Staff from the Early Childhood Education Technical Assistance Center provided a series of trainings for Child Development Services staff. The series was comprised of four monthly sessions targeting Extended School Year Services, Least Restrictive Environment and making sound placement decisions, and Developmental Delay as a Disability Category. Sessions were held virtually for two-hour intervals and contained sample scenarios which were then discussed among the group of State and Site Directors, Program Managers, Administrators and Case Managers. Attendees were offered the opportunity for questions, many of which led to robust conversations in the various topic areas.

**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 children with disabilities.**

Professional development, as part of an effective system of general supervision, is directly linked to the SPP/APR and a number of initiatives and 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, professional development, and dissemination of resources regionally and nationally to provide evidence-based practice professional development to educators and educator leaders, parents, and interested parties.
Maine DOE and CDS have several mechanisms in place to ensure high quality, evidence-based practices 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 include the following:
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 typically follow an alternating year schedule. By working with MADSEC the department is able to respond to the training needs of the State.
Office Hours: Maine DOE has offered topic specific remote sessions throughout 2020-21. These Office Hours sessions have lasted between 45-60 minutes, and all participants were offered a certificate of attendance. Office hours were recorded, and the link to these archived trainings is: https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed/covid19/Administrators/Virtual%20Meeting%20Archives
Other cohort-specific Professional Development trainings included the following:
- Cohort Training
- CAP Specific Training
- CAP Workshops
- How to Choose IEPs for Your Self-Assessment
- B13 Transition Planning
- IEP Training
- Written Notice Training
- Eligibility Forms Training
- Summary of Performance Training
- How to Close Your CAP Training
- Endrew F. and it’s Impact on IEP Development and FAPE
- What’s Next in Monitoring Process
More individualized and specific trainings were also provided as specific questions and/or concerns were raised, and specific feedback was requested by the LEAs themselves, and included the following:
- CDS Trainings
- Proposed Training for Upcoming Audit
- IRLP Training
- Regional Program Training
- Specific LEA Desk Audit Questions/Feedback
- Specific LEA Monitoring Review
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).
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.
PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports): PBIS programming promotes school-wide systemic behavior change in elementary, middle, and high schools. Through a collaborative with the University of Maine, there is a new cohort of 15 schools who started training.
Dyslexia: In partnership with EarlyBird Education, this initiative provides access to a gamified literacy/dyslexia screener application LEAs and is accompanied with data and literacy focused professional development.
Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research (MAIER): MAIER is a collaborative with the department and the University of Maine to build statewide support for autistic students through training, professional development, technical assistance, collaborative consultation, technology, and research.
Maine also 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.

**Broad Stakeholder Input:**

**The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public throughout 2020-2021.
This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).
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. 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 through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include 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 vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.
Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings throughout 2020-2021. SAP members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.
Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021. The MADSEC conferences included sessions on the reauthorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.
Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

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

YES

**Number of Parent Members:**

32

**Parent Members Engagement:**

**Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

Parent participation on the State Advisory Panel and other advisory committees is strong in Maine. The State Advisory Panel (SAP) has strong representation of community stakeholders, including 6 members who are either parents or individuals with disabilities. One fourth of members on Tthe State Dyslexia Stakeholder Group are either parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability; the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Stakeholder Group has 3 parents or individuals with a disability among its 20 members; and the Math4ME (SSIP) Stakeholder group has 12 members including 2 who are either parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. The state also invites parent participation through more informal meetings and communication with the Maine Parent Federation.
These stakeholder groups and the SAP play a direct role in analyzing data, setting targets, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress in activities reported in this SPP/APR. Additionally, to expand parent engagement in development of the new SPP/APR targets and long term strategies to improve student outcomes, throughout 2021, the MPF worked directly with Maine DOE staff in creating a series of recorded videos designed to present APR indicator content, historical data, analysis of trends/forecasts, and implementation strategies to parents and the public. The videos were produced by MPF staff, are presented in non-technical language, and include links to surveys for stakeholder and parent input and suggested target-setting. Maine DOE and MPF publications/announcements on official websites, social media, and announcements at live conference sessions helped to ensure wide dissemination of opportunities for participation. The MPF also conducted multiple live sessions that included the presentation of APR indicator content, historical data, analysis of trends/forecasts, and implementation strategies to parents and the public. These sessions were advertised by DOE and MPF via social media, email, list serves and the Maine DOE website.
Additionally, the Maine DOE Dispute Resolution Team also continues to use established systems to engages parent members to provide opportunities for feedback on the dispute resolution process. Parent members present in the mediations and dispute resolution activities are provided with feedback forms for input on mediations and due process activities. This information is then reviewed by the team and is shared with the mediators and hearing officers. It continues to provide valuable data to improve dispute resolution practice.

**Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

**The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

Supporting diversity of parent participation is a priority for Maine. The capacity for diverse groups of parents to participate in the development of implementation activities is supported in several ways. As noted above, stakeholder groups and the State Advisory Panel (SAP) have strong representation of diverse stakeholders, including parents and public members. The State Dyslexia Stakeholder Group has 20 members, including 5 members who are either parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. The Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Stakeholder Group has 3 parents or individuals with a disability among its 20 members. The Math4ME (SSIP) Stakeholder group has 12 members including 2 who are either parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. The State Advisory Panel has strong representation of community stakeholders, including 6 members who are either parents or individuals with disabilities. Additionally, Maine DOE continues to collaborate with the Maine Parent Federation to formulate strategies, including current ongoing outreach through social media and Maine DOE website postings, to recruit additional parent members and increase the diversity of parents to participate as members of stakeholder groups, the SAP, and recently-formed workgroups such as the Extended Eligibility workgroup, which seeks to improve transition planning for students with disabilities exiting high school.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

The same methods and timelines were used to solicit public input as those used for parent input. As noted above, these included the collaboration of Maine DOE and the Maine Parent Federation in the creation of recorded videos to present APR indicator content, historical data, analysis of trends/forecasts, and implementation strategies for the parents and the public. The videos were presented in non-technical language and include links to surveys for stakeholder input and suggested target-setting. Maine DOE and Maine Parent Federation publications/announcements on official websites, social media, and announcements at live conference sessions helped to ensure wide dissemination of opportunities for participation. The SAP and state advisory groups have strong representation of stakeholders, including parents and public members. The State Advisory Panel met virtually every month throughout 2021. Discussions focused on data analysis, improvement strategies, evaluation of progress and target-setting, The State Advisory Panel includes public members and meetings are open to the public. Discussions included historical data analysis of APR targets, the presentation of forecasting/regression models to anticipate future performance, the development of improvement strategies, and target-setting.

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.**

The results of the data analysis, evaluation, target setting, improvement strategies will be made available through several sources, including publication of the FFY2020 SPP/APR, public DOE Newsroom notices, and public SAP meetings in the Spring of 2022. Additionally, Maine DOE will collaborate with the Maine Parent Federation to provide informational sessions to parents and the public on the outcomes of stakeholder input in the development of APR targets and Improvement strategies.

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 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 2019 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/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, 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 and LEA profile. The profiles provide indicator-specific 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. The indicators are evaluated for level of determination to provide the LEA with measurement-specific feedback on their implementation of IDEA. 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.
A complete copy of Maine’s FFY2019 APR, LEA determinations, and performance of LEAs on the SPP/APR targets are posted on the following webpage: https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed/data/public.
Additionally, student assessment data are available on the following wepage: https://www.maine.gov/doe/Testing\_Accountability/MECAS/results.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## Intro - OSEP Response

## Intro - Required Actions

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

**Measurement**

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2011 | 66.02% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% |
| Data | 73.88% | 72.37% | 72.46% | 73.55% | 72.94% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public throughout 2020-2021.
This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).
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. 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 through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include 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 vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.
Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings throughout 2020-2021. SAP members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.
Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021. The MADSEC conferences included sessions on the reauthorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.
Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 1,579 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 24 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 268 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)**  | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,579 | 1,871 | 72.94% | 90.00% | 84.39% | Did not meet target | N/A |

**Graduation Conditions**

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.**

The standards for obtaining a high school diploma are outlined in Maine statute 20-A Section 4722, which can be found here: https://legislature.maine.gov/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? (yes/no)**

NO

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

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Measurement**

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

**Use 618 exiting data** for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 14.32% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 19.80% | 19.80% | 19.00% | 19.00% | 19.00% |
| Data | 16.15% | 17.23% | 14.35% | 16.39% | 17.91% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 14.32% | 14.32% | 14.32% | 14.32% | 14.32% | 13.32% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public throughout 2020-2021.
This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).
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. 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 through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include 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 vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.
Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings throughout 2020-2021. SAP members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.
Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021. The MADSEC conferences included sessions on the reauthorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.
Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 1

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 1,579 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 24 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 268 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)**  | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 268 | 1,871 | 17.91% | 14.32% | 14.32% | N/A | N/A |

**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: [ (The number of youth with IEPs ages 14 through 20 who exited special education due to dropping out / The number of youth with IEPs ages 14 through 20 who left high school for the reasons listed below) \* 100 ]. Maine has identified 2020 data as the new baseline, as the student exit status of 'died' has been removed from the denominator. 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, and dropping out.

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)**

NO

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.**

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

Maine has identified 2020 data as the new baseline as, consistent with IDEA 618 reporting, the student exit status of 'died' has been removed from the denominator. 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, and dropping out.

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

**Measurement**

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 91.78% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 85.85% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 60.61% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 91.79% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 85.84% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 60.65% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 98.00% | 98.00%  | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public throughout 2020-2021.
This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).
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. 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 through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include 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 vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.
Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings throughout 2020-2021. SAP members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.
Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021. The MADSEC conferences included sessions on the reauthorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.
Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

Maine began using a new statewide assessment in FFY2020 (NWEA Measures of Academic Progress), yielding new baseline participation for this assessment.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 2,590 | 2,587 | 2,087 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 1,087 | 1,530 | 1,104 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 1,201 | 604 | 80 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 89 | 87 | 81 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 2,593 | 2,584 | 2,084 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 1,077 | 1,520 | 1,100 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 1,215 | 614 | 84 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 88 | 84 | 80 |

\*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 2,377 | 2,590 |  | 98.00% | 91.78% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 2,221 | 2,587 |  | 98.00% | 85.85% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 1,265 | 2,087 |  | 98.00% | 60.61% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 2,380 | 2,593 |  | 98.00% | 91.79% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 2,218 | 2,584 |  | 98.00% | 85.84% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 1,264 | 2,084 |  | 98.00% | 60.65% | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

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

https://www.maine.gov/doe/Testing\_Accountability/MECAS/results

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

Maine began using a new statewide assessment in FFY2020 (NWEA Measures of Academic Progress), yielding new baseline participation for this assessment.

## 3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3A - OSEP Response

The State did not provide data for this indicator. OESE gave the State the opportunity to submit data during the official EdFacts resubmission period for assessment data. The State's submitted data will be prefilled in the SPP/APR reporting platform when Part B Clarification period opens on April 14. OSEP will conduct its review of the State’s submitted data after the Clarification period closes.

## 3A - Required Actions

# Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 51.18% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 59.33% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 66.05% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 47.38% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 48.59% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 56.93% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 51.18% | 53.18% | 55.18% | 57.18% | 59.18% | 61.18% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 59.33% | 61.33% | 63.33% | 65.33% | 67.33% | 69.33% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 66.05% | 68.05% | 70.05% | 72.05% | 74.05% | 76.05% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 47.38% | 49.38% | 51.38% | 53.38% | 55.38% | 57.38% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 48.59% | 50.59% | 52.59% | 54.59% | 56.59% | 58.59% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 56.93% | 58.93% | 60.93% | 62.93% | 64.93% | 66.93% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public throughout 2020-2021.
This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).
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. 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 through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include 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 vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.
Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings throughout 2020-2021. SAP members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.
Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021. The MADSEC conferences included sessions on the reauthorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.
Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

Maine began using a new statewide assessment in FFY2020 (NWEA Measures of Academic Progress), yielding new baseline proficiency rates for this assessment.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 2,288 | 2,134 | 1,184 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 690 | 1,006 | 750 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 481 | 260 | 32 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 2,292 | 2,134 | 1,184 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 604 | 815 | 643 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 482 | 222 | 31 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 1,171 | 2,288 |  | 51.18% | 51.18% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 1,266 | 2,134 |  | 59.33% | 59.33% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 782 | 1,184 |  | 66.05% | 66.05% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 1,086 | 2,292 |  | 47.38% | 47.38% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 1,037 | 2,134 |  | 48.59% | 48.59% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 674 | 1,184 |  | 56.93% | 56.93% | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

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

https://www.maine.gov/doe/Testing\_Accountability/MECAS/results

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

Maine began using a new statewide assessment in FFY2020 (NWEA Measures of Academic Progress), yielding new baseline proficiency rates for this assessment.

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

The State did not provide data for this indicator. OESE gave the State the opportunity to submit data during the official EdFacts resubmission period for assessment data. The State's submitted data will be prefilled in the SPP/APR reporting platform when Part B Clarification period opens on April 14. OSEP will conduct its review of the State’s submitted data after the Clarification period closes.

## 3B - Required Actions

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time

of testing.

## 3C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 38.20% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 47.13% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 48.15% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 40.91% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 44.05% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 45.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 38.20% | 40.20% | 42.20% | 44.20% | 46.20% | 48.20% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 47.13% | 49.13% | 51.13% | 53.13% | 55.13% | 57.13% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 48.15% | 50.15% | 52.15% | 54.15% | 56.15% | 58.15% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 40.91% | 42.91% | 44.91% | 46.91% | 48.91% | 50.91% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 44.05% | 46.05% | 48.05% | 50.05% | 52.05% | 54.05% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 45.00% | 47.00% | 49.00% | 51.00% | 53.00% | 55.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public throughout 2020-2021.
This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).
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. 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 through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include 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 vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.
Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings throughout 2020-2021. SAP members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.
Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021. The MADSEC conferences included sessions on the reauthorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.
Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 89 | 87 | 81 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 34 | 41 | 39 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 88 | 84 | 80 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 36 | 37 | 36 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 34 | 89 |  | 38.20% | 38.20% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 41 | 87 |  | 47.13% | 47.13% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 39 | 81 |  | 48.15% | 48.15% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 36 | 88 |  | 40.91% | 40.91% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 37 | 84 |  | 44.05% | 44.05% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 36 | 80 |  | 45.00% | 45.00% | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

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

https://www.maine.gov/doe/Testing\_Accountability/MECAS/results

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

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

The State did not provide data for this indicator. OESE gave the State the opportunity to submit data during the official EdFacts resubmission period for assessment data. The State's submitted data will be prefilled in the SPP/APR reporting platform when Part B Clarification period opens on April 14. OSEP will conduct its review of the State’s submitted data after the Clarification period closes.

## 3C - Required Actions

# Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3D - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 32.35 |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 28.35 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 23.88 |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 32.07 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 36.88 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 33.33 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A <= | Grade 4 | 32.35 | 31.35  | 30.35 | 29.35 | 28.35 | 27.35 |
| Reading | B <= | Grade 8 | 28.35 | 27.35 | 26.35 | 25.35 | 24.35 | 23.35 |
| Reading | C <= | Grade HS | 23.88 | 22.88 | 21.88 | 20.88 | 19.88 | 18.88 |
| Math | A <= | Grade 4 | 32.07 | 31.07 | 30.07 | 29.07 | 28.07 | 27.07 |
| Math | B <= | Grade 8 | 36.88 | 35.88 | 34.88 | 33.88 | 32.88 | 31.88 |
| Math | C <= | Grade HS | 33.33 | 32.33 | 31.33 | 30.33 | 29.33 | 28.33 |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public throughout 2020-2021.
This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).
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. 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 through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include 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 vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.
Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings throughout 2020-2021. SAP members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.
Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021. The MADSEC conferences included sessions on the reauthorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.
Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 11,539 | 12,016 | 8,644 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 2,288 | 2,134 | 1,184 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 8,612 | 10,183 | 7,708 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,027 | 352 | 65 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 690 | 1,006 | 750 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 481 | 260 | 32 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 11,562 | 12,052 | 8,843 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 2,292 | 2,134 | 1,184 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 8,182 | 9,992 | 7,904 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,004 | 309 | 77 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 604 | 815 | 643 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 482 | 222 | 31 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 51.18% | 83.53% |  | 32.35 | 32.35 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 59.33% | 87.67% |  | 28.35 | 28.35 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 66.05% | 89.92% |  | 23.88 | 23.88 | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 47.38% | 79.45% |  | 32.07 | 32.07 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 48.59% | 85.47% |  | 36.88 | 36.88 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 56.93% | 90.25% |  | 33.33 | 33.33 | N/A | N/A |

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

## 3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3D - OSEP Response

The State did not provide data for this indicator. OESE gave the State the opportunity to submit data during the official EdFacts resubmission period for assessment data. The State's submitted data will be prefilled in the SPP/APR reporting platform when Part B Clarification period opens on April 14. OSEP will conduct its review of the State’s submitted data after the Clarification period closes.

## 3D - Required Actions

# Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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))

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its 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 such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2016 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 1.57% | 1.52% | 1.52% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public throughout 2020-2021.
This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).
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. 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 through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include 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 vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.
Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings throughout 2020-2021. SAP members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.
Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021. The MADSEC conferences included sessions on the reauthorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.
Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

69

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 3 | 196 | 1.52% | 0.00% | 1.53% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**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

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

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.

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

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 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.**

Data from the 2019-2020 report of children with disabilities subject to disciplinary removal were examined to determine if significant discrepancies were occurring in the rates of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days. 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 to ensure 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. Maine did not identify noncompliance with the Part B requirements as a result of the reviews.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **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 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4A - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 4A - Required Actions

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

 A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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))

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2016 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity** | **Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements** | **Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 3 | 0 | 194 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

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.

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

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 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 Indicator 4B, the data were disaggregated by race/ethnicity. For LEAs exhibiting a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity in the rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days, Maine 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 to ensure 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.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **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 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4B - OSEP Response

## 4B- Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

**Measurement**

 A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

 B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

 C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

**Instructions**

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2019 | Target >= | 67.00% | 68.00% | 69.00% | 70.00% | 70.00% |
| A | 56.11% | Data | 56.69% | 56.58% | 56.41% | 55.52% | 56.11% |
| B | 2019 | Target <= | 9.00% | 9.00% | 9.00% | 9.00% | 9.00% |
| B | 10.78% | Data | 10.78% | 10.88% | 10.33% | 10.39% | 10.78% |
| C | 2019 | Target <= | 3.10% | 3.10% | 3.10% | 3.10% | 3.10% |
| C | 3.46% | Data | 3.13% | 3.24% | 3.07% | 3.46% | 3.46% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 56.11% | 56.11% | 56.33% | 56.33% | 56.66% | 57.00% |
| Target B <= | 10.78% | 10.42% | 10.07% | 9.71% | 9.36% | 9.00% |
| Target C <= | 3.46% | 3.46% | 3.46% | 3.34% | 3.22% | 3.10% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public throughout 2020-2021.
This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).
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. 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 through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include 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 vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.
Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings throughout 2020-2021. SAP members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.
Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021. The MADSEC conferences included sessions on the reauthorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.
Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 31,989 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 17,567 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 3,537 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools | 923 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities | 168 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 24 |

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

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 17,567 | 31,989 | 56.11% | 56.11% | 54.92% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 3,537 | 31,989 | 10.78% | 10.78% | 11.06% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 1,115 | 31,989 | 3.46% | 3.46% | 3.49% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | The reason for slippage is unclear. However, the FFY2020 percentage is within the typical historical year-to-year variability for this indicator. Maine will continue to monitor this indicator to determine the overall trend. |

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

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.

 C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

**Measurement**

 A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

 B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

 C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| **A** | Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| **A** | Data | 75.20% | 74.69% | 68.32% | 46.07% | 39.92% |
| **B** | Target <= |  |  |  |  |  |
| **B** | Data | 0.74% | 12.87% | 14.98% | 23.50% | 24.24% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public throughout 2020-2021.
This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).
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. 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 through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include 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 vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.
Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings throughout 2020-2021. SAP members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.
Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021. The MADSEC conferences included sessions on the reauthorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.
Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

**Targets**

**Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.**

Inclusive Targets

**Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.**

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

| **Part** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | 2019 | 39.92% |
| **B** | 2019 | 24.24% |
| **C** | 2020 | 0.36% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 39.92% | 42.54% | 45.15% | 47.78% | 50.38% | 53.00% |
| Target B <= | 24.24% | 21.89% | 19.54% | 17.20% | 14.85% | 12.50% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target C <= | 0.36% | 0.36% | 0.36% | 0.36% | 0.36% | 0.30% |

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/07/2021

| **Description** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **3 through 5 - Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total number of children with IEPs | 826 | 1,476 | 191 | 2,493 |
| 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 | 197 | 544 | 93 | 834 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 120 | 137 | 23 | 280 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school | 168 | 168 | 30 | 366 |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| c1**.** Numberof children receiving special education and related services in the home | 4 | 3 | 2 | 9 |

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

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 834 | 2,493 | 39.92% | 39.92% | 33.45% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 646 | 2,493 | 24.24% | 24.24% | 25.91% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| C. Home | 9 | 2,493 |  | 0.36% | 0.36% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group A aged 3 through 5, if applicable**

While the exact cause for slippage is unclear, contributing factors could include Maine’s continued technical assistance on preschool educational environments, combined with the full implementation of a new data system producing data that more accurately reflect the different educational environments in which children receive special education services. In addition, Maine continues to see a trend of a high percentage 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, which is often outside of a classroom. Additionally, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, many of Maine’s families continue to request remote or telehealth services primarily for speech and language services, but also for other related services including services for social emotional and behavioral supports.

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B aged 3 through 5, if applicable**

The Child Development Services system is dependent on the availability of public and private providers for the least restrictive environment for children with IEP’s. Given the pandemic, Maine has witnessed a many program closures, limiting the number of inclusionary opportunities. Although the reason for slippage is unclear, the percentage is within the historical year to year variability for this indicator. Maine will continue to monitor the availability of programming to determine if this is the reason for slippage.

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

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must revise the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

Maine has revised the baseline for 6A and 6B to reflect FFY 2019 data. The baseline for 6C is FFY 2020 data.

## 6 - OSEP Response

The State has established baseline for indicator 6C, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

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

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

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

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

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

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

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

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:**

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

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

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

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

**Instructions**

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

In the measurement 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.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

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

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

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

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A1 | 2008 | Target >= | 64.00% | 64.00% | 64.00% | 65.00% | 65.00% |
| A1 | 63.10% | Data | 69.42% | 72.36% | 67.54% | 69.79% | 73.05% |
| A2 | 2008 | Target >= | 38.00% | 38.00% | 38.00% | 39.00% | 39.00% |
| A2 | 37.00% | Data | 49.21% | 43.24% | 40.91% | 38.53% | 35.55% |
| B1 | 2008 | Target >= | 67.00% | 67.00% | 67.00% | 68.00% | 68.00% |
| B1 | 65.50% | Data | 75.37% | 75.30% | 69.16% | 73.34% | 73.12% |
| B2 | 2008 | Target >= | 36.00% | 36.00% | 36.00% | 37.00% | 37.00% |
| B2 | 35.40% | Data | 51.04% | 42.31% | 40.46% | 40.90% | 38.98% |
| C1 | 2008 | Target >= | 59.00% | 59.00% | 59.00% | 60.00% | 60.00% |
| C1 | 58.30% | Data | 66.88% | 68.74% | 64.53% | 68.48% | 71.93% |
| C2 | 2008 | Target >= | 52.00% | 52.00% | 52.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% |
| C2 | 51.00% | Data | 67.48% | 60.57% | 55.46% | 55.95% | 53.74% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1 >= | 66.50% | 66.00% | 66.50% | 67.00% | 67.50% | 68.00% |
| Target A2 >= | 39.00% | 39.00% | 39.00% | 39.00% | 39.00% | 39.00% |
| Target B1 >= | 68.33% | 68.66% | 68.99% | 69.33% | 69.66% | 70.00% |
| Target B2 >= | 37.00% | 37.00% | 37.00% | 37.00% | 37.00% | 37.00% |
| Target C1 >= | 61.33% | 62.66% | 64.00% | 65.33% | 66.66% | 68.00% |
| Target C2 >= | 53.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public throughout 2020-2021.
This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).
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. 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 through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include 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 vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.
Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings throughout 2020-2021. SAP members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.
Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021. The MADSEC conferences included sessions on the reauthorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.
Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

1,749

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

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 15 | 0.86% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 454 | 25.96% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 663 | 37.91% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 331 | 18.93% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 286 | 16.35% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 994 | 1,463 | 73.05% | 66.50% | 67.94% | Met target | No Slippage |
| 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 617 | 1,749 | 35.55% | 39.00% | 35.28% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 7 | 0.40% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 441 | 25.21% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 674 | 38.54% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 344 | 19.67% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 283 | 16.18% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 1,018 | 1,466 | 73.12% | 68.33% | 69.44% | Met target | No Slippage |
| 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 627 | 1,749 | 38.98% | 37.00% | 35.85% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

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

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 13 | 0.74% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 343 | 19.61% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 488 | 27.90% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 287 | 16.41% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 618 | 35.33% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.*Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*  | 775 | 1,131 | 71.93% | 61.33% | 68.52% | Met target | No Slippage |
| 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 905 | 1,749 | 53.74% | 53.00% | 51.74% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **B2** | More significant child needs may have contributed to slippage in the percentage of children who are functioning within age expectations in their acquisition and use of knowledge and skills. This is reflected in the increase in children eligible under Developmental Delay and decrease in children eligible under Speech and Language Impairment. Childcare / preschool program closures in response to the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in disruption of routine and inconsistency in children receiving services. Additionally, disruptions in service provision resulted from voluntary parent withdrawal from services and educational environments. |
| **C2** | Factors that may have resulted in slippage in the percentage of children who function within age expectations in their use of appropriate behavior to meet needs include the increase from FFY 2019 to FFY 2020 in children eligible in the category of Developmental Delay and decrease in children eligible under Speech and Language Impairment. Impacts related to the COVID-19 pandemic include a shift to remote therapy sessions, families either choosing not to send their children into programs for safety reasons or illness, provider shortage and staffing challenges, and family dynamics shifting to meeting basic needs and protecting health and safety. Additionally, inconsistency in children attending programs and potential substitutions in their regular providers due to staffing and illness may disrupt routines that foster children’s use of appropriate behavior. Maine will continue to develop and disseminate guidance to inform statewide consistent completion of the Child Outcomes Summary Form. |

**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/no)**

YES

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used?  | NO |

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

YES

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

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

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

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8: Parent involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of parents from whom response is requested****is allowed.* *When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

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

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023,** when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

## 8 - Indicator Data

| **Question** | **Yes / No**  |
| --- | --- |
| Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?  | YES |
| If yes, will you be providing the data for preschool children separately? | NO |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public throughout 2020-2021.
This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).
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. 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 through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include 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 vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.
Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings throughout 2020-2021. SAP members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.
Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021. The MADSEC conferences included sessions on the reauthorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.
Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2006 | 87.40% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% |
| Data | 93.95% | 91.61% | 92.94% | 89.41% | 91.89% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 822 | 889 | 91.89% | 91.00% | 92.46% | Met target | No Slippage |

**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) were gathered from a sample of Child Development Services (CDS) sites. School-aged data were 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 CDS (pre-school) and DOE are reported jointly for this indicator because the targets have been set for combined CDS and DOE data.

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

5,928

**Percentage of respondent parents**

15.00%

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Response Rate  | 5.71% | 15.00% |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

Maine DOE attempts to reach all parents within the monitored cohort. Maine DOE provides an electronic link to the parent survey to all monitored LEAs, and LEAs provided the link to all parents of students with IEPs in the LEAs. For Child Development Services (preschool), a systematic random sample of parents whose children received special education services during the reporting period were sent a survey link via email. Responses for the parent satisfaction survey resulted in a response rate of 15.00%, which is a significant improvement from FFY2019 (5.71%). Maine will strive for continuous improvement in communication with LEAs in soliciting parent input (e.g., provide email reminders for input and sharing parent survey results with LEAs) and in the analysis of underrepresented groups (e.g., potential redesign of random sample methodology based on analyses indicating underrepresented groups).

**Describe the analysis** **of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.**

Analyses of the sample's representativeness of the population of monitored districts were conducted for race/ethnicity to uncover potential non-response bias for this demographic. Respondent data were found to be representative of the population of students with disabilities within the LEA population percentages for race/ethnicity (within 5% of the population values). Based on stakeholder input and future APR requirements, Maine will include additional demographic analyses of respondents to include age of student, disability category, and/or geographic location in the State. New demographic data will be used for identification of potential non-response bias. When discovered, modifications may be made to the sampling method to better target underrepresented groups.

**Include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.**

Analyses of the sample's representativeness of the population of monitored districts were conducted for race/ethnicity. Respondent data were found to be representative of the population of students with disabilities within the LEA population percentages for race/ethnicity (within 5% of the population values). Based on stakeholder input and future APR requirements, Maine will include additional demographic analysis of respondents to include age of student, disability category, and/or geographic location in the State.

**The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)**

YES

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

The respondent representativeness was assessed for race/ethnicity using the representativeness metric of +/- 5% of the population values. The analyses indicated that these groups were represented within 5% of the population percentages. Based on stakeholder input and future APR requirements, Maine will include additional demographic analysis of respondents, to include age of student, disability category, and/or geographic location in the State.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used?  | YES |
| If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed? | YES |
| If yes, provide sampling plan. | Indicator B8 Sampling Method |

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

Maine DOE's sampling methodology has not changed from the previously approved sampling plan. Child Development Services' (CDS) sampling methodology differed in FFY2020 but CDS will again utilize the previously approved sampling methodology in the future. DOE provided an electronic link to a parent survey to all monitored LEAs, and LEAs provided the link to all parents of students with IEPs in the LEAs. The Child Development Services (preschool) sampling method differed from that used in previous years out of temporary necessity due to staff turnover. Time constraints necessitated the implementation of this method for this reporting year only. For FFY2020, CDS utilized a random sampling strategy that involved the directors at each of the 9 regional CDS sites sending the parent satisfaction survey via email to the parents of 20 randomly selected children that received early childhood special education services from each CDS site during FFY2020. For CDS, 180 surveys were sent to families via an electronic link; 23 parents responded to the survey. Data for CDS and DOE are reported jointly for this indicator because the targets have been set for combined CDS and DOE data. The data are analyzed for nonresponse bias and representativeness of race/ethnicity using a metric of +/- 5%. Respondent data were found to be representative of the population of students with disabilities within the population percentages for race/ethnicity (within 5% of the population values).

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used?  | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |
| If yes, provide a copy of the survey. |  |

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

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not describe the metric used to determine representativeness, as required.

The State reported that sampling was used to collect data for this indicator and that the previously approved sampling plan had not changed. In order to report data for this indicator using sampling for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, the State must submit its sampling plan to OSEP and provide data consistent with the approved sampling plan.

## 8 - Required Actions

# Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**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))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “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).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, 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 as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, 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 excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

109

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 and/or cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 0 | 143 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**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 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.

**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 of racial/ethnic groups in special education. Therefore, there was no review to determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

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

Baseline for this indicator is 2020, as states are now required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **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 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

The State reported its baseline for this indicator using data from FFY 2016; however, OSEP cannot accept this baseline because of revisions to the Measurement Table. Specifically, with the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, all States are now required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline using FFY 2020 data.

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**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))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “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).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, 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 excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

118

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 2 | 0 | 134 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**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 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 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.

**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.**

For districts exhibiting disproportionate representation, Maine DOE reviews the districts' policies, procedures, and practices with a compliance instrument to test compliance for 36 items. This document includes a component that identifies students who are English Language Learners, in a effort to ensure all eligibility/re-eligibility decisions are based on appropriate referral and re-evaluation protocols specific to IDEA requirements. The purpose of this review is to ensure appropriate eligibility considerations, proper development and implementation of IEPs, and the inclusion of procedural safeguards.

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

Baseline for this indicator is 2020, as states are now required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **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 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

The State reported its baseline for this indicator using data from FFY 2016; however, OSEP cannot accept this baseline because of revisions to the Measurement Table. Specifically, with the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, all States are now required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline using FFY 2020 data.

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: Child Find

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations.

**Measurement**

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

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

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.

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

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

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

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child’s previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2012 | 86.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 83.02% | 91.24% | 92.65% | 93.23% | 92.52% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 820 | 627 | 92.52% | 100% | 76.46% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage**

In Maine, children ages 3 through 5 are educated in two separate systems (Child Development Services (CDS) and Maine Department of Education (Maine DOE)). Children ages 3 through 5 served by CDS must be evaluated within 60 days, while school aged children ages 5 - 21 must be evaluated within 45 days. Therefore, the child find counts and analyses are reported separately (see text boxes below) and reasons for slippage are reported separately:
CDS: Potential reasons for slippage include cancellations due to provider illness, including COVID infections and quarantines and related program closures. This prevented evaluations or observations from taking place either in the clinical or childcare settings. In addition, delays were caused by evaluators’ capacity to accommodate both new children coming into the system and rescheduling missed evaluations. Some regions of the state experienced consistently high level of COVID infection and community spread, which could be related to the shortage of evaluators in regions with high populations. Inclement weather also resulted in cancellations of evaluations, impacting the timeline in which children underwent evaluations following their parent providing consent. Additionally, there is a statewide shortage of professionals that complete psychological evaluations.
DOE: Slippage may be due to the ongoing COVID pandemic, which resulted in a variety of challenges, including, but not limited to:
- ongoing and significant staff shortages in all areas
- Increased numbers of Emergency Certified teachers responsible for the completion of referrals and all related eligibility forms etc.
- Increased numbers of Emergency Certified teachers responsible for all programming components on the IEPs, as well as the provision of FAPE
- Change in Professional Development opportunities from in person to Zoom
- Administrative turnover
- Special Education staff turnover
- Related service provider turnover

**Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)**

193

**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.**

In Maine, children ages 3 through 5 are educated in two separate systems (Child Development Services (CDS) and Maine Department of Education (Maine DOE)). Children ages 3 through 5 served by CDS must be evaluated within 60 days, while school aged children ages 5 - 21 must be evaluated within 45 days. Therefore, the child find counts and analyses are reported separately below.

Child Development Services (CDS):
(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received = 537
(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days = 370
Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who were evaluated within 60 days = [ (370 / 537) \* 100 ] = 68.90%

Reason for Delay
CDS (no delay reason was given and/or delay was caused by regional site/staff) = 60
Provider = 107

Days Beyond Timeline
61-75 = 46
Over 75 = 121

Potential reasons for slippage include cancellations due to provider illness, including COVID infections and quarantines and related program closures. This prevented evaluations or observations from taking place either in the clinical or childcare settings. In addition, delays were caused by evaluators’ capacity to accommodate both new children coming into the system and rescheduling missed evaluations. Some regions of the state experienced consistently high level of COVID infection and community spread, which could be related to the shortage of evaluators in regions with high populations. Inclement weather also resulted in cancellations of evaluations, impacting the timeline in which children underwent evaluations following their parent providing consent. Additionally, there is a statewide shortage of professionals that complete psychological evaluations.

Maine DOE:
(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received = 283
(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 45 school days = 257
Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who were evaluated within 60 days = [ (257 / 283) \* 100 ] = 90.81%

The 52 LEAs monitored received 283 parental consents for evaluation with the number of educational files reviewed as outlined below:
Child; Count Number of Files
0 - 49; 15
50 - 199; 20
200 - 400; 30
More than 400; 50

As indicated above, 257 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.

All students included in (a) but not included in (b) have completed initial evaluations, but they were not within the state-established timeline. The delays for these students ranged from 2 to 54 days. Reasons for these delays included lack of personnel resources to schedule and/or complete evaluation, the external evaluator failed to meet evaluation timelines, or the child was not available due to school activities.

Slippage may be due to the ongoing COVID pandemic, which resulted in a variety of challenges, including, but not limited to:
- ongoing and significant staff shortages in all areas
- Increased numbers of Emergency Certified teachers responsible for the completion of referrals and all related eligibility forms etc.
- Increased numbers of Emergency Certified teachers responsible for all programming components on the IEPs, as well as the provision of FAPE
- Change in Professional Development opportunities from in person to Zoom
- Administrative turnover
- Special Education staff turnover
- Related service provider turnover

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

**What is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).**

Maine DOE used a 45 day timeframe and Child Development Services used a 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.

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

State monitoring

**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 for all of the 9 regional CDS sites. Data were collected for this indicator from the statewide database, Child Information Network Connection (CINC), and include all child records in the system over the entire reporting year.

School Aged (ages 5-21): 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 52 LEAs that were monitored during FFY2020. B11 submissions include the following materials:
- first 10 parental consents (initial referrals only)
- date stamped, or otherwise noted, when received in SAU
- cover page of each evaluation documented on the consent forms
- each eval date stamped, or otherwise noted, when received in SAU
- school calendars which clearly outline “student” days versus “non-student” days, including snow days or alternate learning day related to COVID, etc.
- evaluation tracking tool
- eligibility forms used to determine disability category
- corresponding written notices

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. Data collected on students whose files are randomly selected for on site review and received initial evaluation during the 2020-21 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.

As follow up to Desk Audit, all LEAs in cohort participated in a review with representatives from the Supervision and Monitoring Team. Due to COVID restrictions, many of these meetings were done virtually. The goal of this follow up meeting was to review and verify information on the LEAs self-assessment and to generate their Corrective Action Plan.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 56 | 56 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2019 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:
Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2019 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 5-21): Children aged 5-20 Evaluated within the State-Established Timeline of 45 Days:
Prior to considering any finding from FFY2019 corrected, Maine DOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.301(c)(1), (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.

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

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Children Evaluated Within 60 Days:
CDS was 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 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 5-21): Children aged 5-21 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 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.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

Maine has reported on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator.

## 11 - OSEP Response

In its description of correction of noncompliance, the State referenced an incorrect regulatory citation. Therefore, the State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system.

## 11 - Required Actions

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: 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))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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

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

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

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

 e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

 f. # 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.

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

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

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

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

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 97.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.67% | 81.62% | 80.00% | 89.72% | 88.44% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.  | 297 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.  | 34 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.  | 137 |
| d. Number 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.  | 53 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.  | 12 |
| 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 |

| **Measure** | **Numerator (c)** | **Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. | 137 | 198 | 88.44% | 100% | 69.19% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Contributing factors for slippage may include provider shortages due to staffing challenges, with some related to intermittent COVID infections and quarantines. Delays in IEPs being implemented before a child’s third birthday are often associated with delays in the availability of providers to complete evaluations and subsequently schedule an IEP meeting to determine eligibility and formulate an IEP. Additionally, at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, in person evaluations were not possible, and documentation in the data system indicates that CDS personnel kept child files open until evaluations could be completed either in person or remotely. In some cases, remote evaluations were attempted, but the child’s challenges engaging in this method resulted in insufficient results to determine eligibility and caused delays in the IEP team’s ability to convene for an eligibility meeting prior to the child’s third birthday. Additionally, inclement weather resulted in cancellations of evaluations and meetings, impacting the timeline in which children’s IEPs are able to be written.

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

61

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

Days beyond; Number of Children
 0-15 Days; 16
 16-30 Days; 14
 31-60 Days; 14
 60+ Days; 17

Reasons for Delay Number of Children

CDS 33
Contracted provider 28

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

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

State monitoring

**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 using the most recently available data from a date range of 3/1/2021-6/30/2021. Findings of noncompliance were made based on a review of these data. This report includes all children referred to Part B from Part C after having received early intervention services prior to age 3.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 26 | 26 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2019 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 2019 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.124 as evidenced by updated data subsequently collected through the 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). A review of children in the data system during the reporting period showed that children that previously out of compliance during the prior year’s reporting period have since either been withdrawn by parents, moved out of the SAU’s catchment area, or have had an Individualized Education Plan implemented.
A Corrective Action Plan was drafted between the State IEU and the 9 regional sites. To ensure that this oversight has occurred, the State IEU sent a report to regional site directors at the beginning of each month, requiring a response that indicated all children’s IEPs that appeared on the statewide report had been reviewed and finalized.

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

Based on a review of individual child information in the state data system for the previous reporting year (7/1/2019-6/30/2020), the state was 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, unless the child was removed from the program by their parent or moved out of state.
Delays in IEPs being implemented before a child’s third birthday are often associated with delays in the availability of providers to complete evaluations and subsequently schedule an IEP meeting to determine eligibility and formulate an IEP. Additionally, at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, in person evaluations were not possible, and documentation in the data system indicates that CDS personnel kept child files open until evaluations could be completed either in person or remotely.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

Maine reported on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator.

## 12 - OSEP Response

In its description of correction of noncompliance, the State referenced an incorrect regulatory citation. Therefore, the State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system.

## 12 - Required Actions

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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

If a State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2012 | 36.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 88.96% | 94.38% | 95.12% | 97.08% | 93.97% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 54 | 147 | 93.97% | 100% | 36.73% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The reason for slippage is unclear, but the ongoing Covid pandemic resulted in a variety of challenges that may have impacted this indicator, including, but not limited to, the following:
- IEP format change in August 2019 (19-20 cohort had Desk Audit on the old IEP format, then made corrections on the new IEP format)
- Ongoing and significant staff shortages in all areas
- Increased numbers of emergency certified teachers responsible for the development of transition plans and other programming components on the IEPs, as well as the provision of FAPE
- Change of professional development opportunities from in person sessions to Zoom sessions
- Zoom fatigue
- Increased administrative turnover
- Increased special education staff turnover
- Increased related service provider turnover

Although the Office of Special Education Programs mandates an “all or nothing” approach with Indicator B13, another consideration would be the possibility of reviewing the individual transition components and the data for each. As demonstrated below, with the exception of TRA8 and TRA9, there was very little slippage between 2019-2020 and 2020-2021. The slippage in TRA8 can be tied directly to improved guidance to the field, per OSEP feedback, that states Transition Services cannot be documented as “Child will…” statements, because these services are intended to be provided by the adults in the school and the community. This feedback, and our change in practice, will result in the development of more compliant and effective transition plans for students moving forward.

Our Codes 2019-2020 2020-2021
TRA1 – purpose of meeting 100% 86.36%
TRA2 – child invited to meeting 100% 91.59%
TRA3 – agency invited parent’s prior consent 97.44% 90.50%
TRA4 – post-secondary goals updated annually 99.49% 91.82%
TRA5 – age appropriate assessments 100% 96.55%
TRA6a – measurable post-secondary goals in education/training100% 97.67%
TRA6b – measurable post-secondary goals in employment 100% 96.90%
TRA6c – measurable post-secondary goals in independent living 100% 98.64%
TRA7 – course of study 100% 95.35%
TRA8 – transition services 97.44% 48.84%
TRA9 – alignment between transition goals and annual goals91.79% 70.97%

In an effort to address this slippage, the Maine DOE Office of Special Services Monitoring and Supervision Team has implemented the following interventions and supports:
- Increased Office Hours with a focus on Transition Planning/B13 scheduled on 3/9/22, 3/23/22, 4/13/22 and 4/27/22
- Increased feedback offered on B13 screeners, with follow up one month prior to onsite review
- Statewide B13 training held 1/5/22, in the morning and afternoon, with an expectation that staff in cohort participate; 407 individuals registered; 188 participated in the morning session and 122 participated in the afternoon session
- Statewide B13 training held 1/5/22 was recorded and will be posted on the Professional Development site and available to the field
- Close monitoring of B13 screener data to support and train those LEAs who do not meet screener compliance prior to their submission of final B13/Transition Plans
- Development of a One Pager that outlines the expectations for each component of the B13 Indicator, which is shared with the field, especially those in cohort
- Sharing of a PDF of Procedural Manual at all trainings
- Embedding Procedural Manual clips, page numbers specific to Transition Planning/B13, in all trainings
- Sharing of a PDF of Maine Unified Special Education Regulations (MUSER) at all trainings

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

State monitoring

**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. Maine Unified Special Education Regulations (MUSER) outlines the General Supervision Systems.
Per MUSER XIII.1, “Using data and quantitative key compliance and performance indicators to be determined by the Department, representatives of the Commissioner shall collect data and report on every SAU program at least once during the six year period of the State’s Performance Plan.” Therefore, all Maine SAUs are placed in a 4-year cohort. These cohorts are amended, if needed, based on the following factors:
- Change in Special Education Director
- High staff turnover
- Ongoing concerns
- Discretion of the Supervision/Monitoring Team
As part of the Self-Assessment, all LEAs in cohort are asked to send in two B13 screeners, which includes Section 9 of the IEP only. These screeners are reviewed for compliance and feedback is offered to the LEA. All feedback was given prior to the Statewide B13 training which occurred on 1/5/22 (see above information). This gave each LEA the opportunity to participate in professional development in this area and develop compliant, appropriate transition plans.

The final data for this indicator reflects direct monitoring data. Postsecondary transition data were collected from the FFY2020 monitored LEAs. The number of educational files reviewed for this indicator is based on child count, and is outlined below:

Child Count Number of Files
0 – 50 2
50 – 200 4
200 – 400 6
400 – 750 8
More than 750 10

Postsecondary plans were evaluated using the postsecondary transition plan checklist developed by the National Technical Assistance Center for Transition (NTACT). Findings of noncompliance were identified both through self-assessment and were verified during on-site assessment or as part of a Zoom review, depending on COVID status of the LEA and their preference.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?  | YES |
| If yes, 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? | NO |

**If no, please explain**

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.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7 | 1 | 6 | 0 |

**FFY 2019 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 FFY2019 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 on their Corrective Action Plan (CAP). 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.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

Maine has reported on the correction status and verification process for noncompliance identified in the FFY2019 APR.

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - Required Actions

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

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

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

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school****is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

**I. *Definitions***

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

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: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). 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.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

**II. *Data Reporting***

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

 1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;

 2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);

3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);

4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators***

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analyses 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. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023,** when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents 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, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2016 | Target >= | 25.00% | 25.00% | 27.00% | 30.00% | 30.00% |
| A | 18.81% | Data | 26.30% | 18.81% | 17.27% | 19.49% | 23.78% |
| B | 2016 | Target >= | 76.60% | 77.00% | 79.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% |
| B | 65.68% | Data | 68.87% | 65.68% | 71.21% | 70.04% | 66.19% |
| C | 2016 | Target >= | 82.30% | 83.00% | 84.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% |
| C | 77.56% | Data | 96.16% | 77.56% | 80.91% | 80.51% | 76.50% |

**FFY 2020 Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 30.00% | 30.00% | 30.00% | 30.00% | 30.00% | 30.00% |
| Target B >= | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% |
| Target C >= | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public throughout 2020-2021.
This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).
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. 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 through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include 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 vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.
Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings throughout 2020-2021. SAP members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.
Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021. The MADSEC conferences included sessions on the reauthorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.
Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 1,210 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 260 |
| Response Rate | 21.49% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school  | 44 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  | 124 |
| 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) | 6 |
| 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). | 14 |

| **Measure** | **Number of respondent youth** | **Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 44 | 260 | 23.78% | 30.00% | 16.92% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 168 | 260 | 66.19% | 80.00% | 64.62% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| 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) | 188 | 260 | 76.50% | 85.00% | 72.31% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | There was a decrease in higher education enrollment compared to FFY2019. The reason for the decrease is not clear, but it appears likely that higher education enrollment was impacted by COVID-19, as were the employment categories. It is notable that the FFY2020 percentage is closer to the FFY2018 percentage and those of the most recent previous years, as the percentage for FFY2019 was particularly high within the most recent 5-year span. Maine will continue to monitor year-to-year variability to assess the trend. |
| **B** | There were decreases in the employment categories for the 2nd consecutive year. Although it is not clear, it appears likely these categories were impacted by COVID-19, given some of the survey comments. The former students' individual needs/safety and/or changes in the circumstances of employers may have interrupted employment.  |
| **C** | There were decreases in the employment categories for the 2nd consecutive year. Although it is not clear, it appears likely these categories were impacted by COVID-19, given some of the survey comments. The former students' individual needs/safety and/or changes in the circumstances of employers may have interrupted employment.  |

**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.

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Response Rate  | 27.03% | 21.49% |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

Maine's 2020 response rate was lower than the 2019 response rate. The reasons for the decline are unclear. Maine attempts a census (rather than a sample) of all qualified exiters for the reporting year and attempts at least two phone calls for each non-respondent. However, post-school contact information for students is not always accurate/up to date, phone numbers change, etc. Maine will work with districts to convey the importance and use of the post-school survey to ensure the most recent district contact information is on file and will discuss possible use of additional methods of contact (e.g., mailings). Maine will also discuss with LEAs the importance of representation of underrepresented groups of students. When underrepresented groups are identified, Maine will take extra efforts (e.g., additional phone call attempts) to reach representatives of these groups.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

Maine is, and has historically been, vigilant in attempts to identify potential nonresponse bias to ensure strong representativeness across the State. Maine continues to assess representativeness of respondents with respect to race/ethnicity, disability, and gender. Additionally, Maine attempts to contact all qualified exiters (conducting a census attempt, rather than a sample) to help promote respondent representation across a broad cross section of exiters. Representativeness analyses indicated that respondents were represented at least to the extent that they existed in the population or, when less, were within 5% of the population percentages of exiters. Maine will continue to strive for greater representativeness of respondents (e.g. within 3% of population percentages); when underrepresented groups are identified, Maine will make additional efforts (e.g., additional phone call attempts) to reach representatives of these groups.

**Include the State’s analyses 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 1,210 of the former students. The total count of survey respondents was 260, yielding a response rate of 21.49%. The respondent representativeness of the population of exiters (youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school) was assessed for Gender, Disability, and Race/Ethnicity. The analyses indicated that these groups were represented at least to the extent that they existed in the population or, when less, were within 5% of the population percentages of exiters. The analysis indicates that the response group was representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

YES

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

The respondent representativeness of the population of exiters (youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school) was assessed for Gender, Disability, and Race/Ethnicity. The analyses indicated that these groups were represented at least to the extent that they existed in the population or, when less, were within 5% of the population percentages of exiters.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used?  | NO |

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used?  | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |

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

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 14 - Required Actions

# Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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))

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

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

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

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

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 2 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 1 |

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

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public throughout 2020-2021.
This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).
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. 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 through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include 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 vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.
Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings throughout 2020-2021. SAP members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.
Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021. The MADSEC conferences included sessions on the reauthorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.
Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 57.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 58.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% |
| Data |  | 0.00% | 14.29% | 40.00% |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 58.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 |  | 58.00% | 50.00% | Did not meet target | N/A |

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

Maine reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2020. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2020. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

## 15 - Required Actions

# Indicator 16: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**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))

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

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

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

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

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1 Mediations held | 46 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 20 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 11 |

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

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public throughout 2020-2021.
This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).
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. 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 through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include 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 vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.
Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings throughout 2020-2021. SAP members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.
Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021. The MADSEC conferences included sessions on the reauthorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.
Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 83.30% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% |
| Data | 71.79% | 60.47% | 69.09% | 67.31% | 70.21% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 20 | 11 | 46 | 70.21% | 85.00% | 67.39% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The reason for slippage is unclear. However, the FFY2020 percentage of 67.39% is within the typical year-to-year variability for this indicator and the trend has generally improved since FFY2016. Maine will continue to monitor this indicator to determine the overall trend.

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

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 16 - Required Actions

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

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

**Measurement**

The State’s SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

**Instructions**

**Baseline Data*:*** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets*:*** In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State’s FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State’s baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State’s targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

*Phase I: Analysis:*

- Data Analysis;

- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;

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

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

*Phase II: Plan* (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;

- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and

- Evaluation.

*Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation* (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

**Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP**

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

***Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation***

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State’s last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

**Section A: Data Analysis**

**What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?**

The Maine Department of Education (Maine DOE) 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. This initiative has been named Math4ME ("Math for Maine”). The State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) is measured as follows: Students in grades 3–8 with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) will demonstrate improved math proficiency as measured by math scores on the statewide Maine Educational Assessment (MEA). Maine reports proficiency as follows: Percent = number of grade 3–8 students with IEPs who demonstrate proficiency in math divided by the number of grade 3–8 students with IEPs who are evaluated on the math assessment.

**Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)**

YES

**Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.**

Analyses are conducted on the math performance/proficiency rates of students with disabilities in grades 3–8.

**Is the State’s theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

https://www.maine.gov/doe/sites/maine.gov.doe/files/inline-files/Math4ME%20Logic%20Model%202021.xls.pdf

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or** **justification for the changes.**

Adjustments were made to the Math4ME professional development model based on feedback from stakeholder groups (e.g., general and special educators, administrators, parents) and effects of the pandemic and data from the project over the past 5 years. The main components of these changes are a shift to remote training focusing on rural special educators and their paraprofessionals, professional learning communities (PLCs) and approaches to develop family engagement.

In pre-pandemic Maine, professional development opportunities were concentrated near locations with larger populations – Portland, Augusta, and Bangor. Educators in northern Maine bordering Canada and down east Maine would travel hours to participate in this professional learning and pay to stay overnight for any extended sessions. Lessons learned and experienced through the pandemic have led the Math4ME stakeholders and DOE team to shift to programming to remote sessions and in doing so, decided that this change must be provided for rural educators to access programming. This year, Math4ME training was provided through synchronous and asynchronous online sessions. Participants are actively engaged in the sessions with online and hands on math tools and manipulatives, breakout rooms, and other interactive online tools (annotations, polls, quizzes, etc.)

Survey and Fidelity of Practice data over the past 5 years demonstrate that Math4ME special educators gained knowledge and conceptual understanding of mathematical principles, however, the effects on student learning were not as strong as desired. Special educators in Maine plan and provide specially designed instruction for students, manage caseloads, write IEPs and meet with families. Paraprofessionals (called Educational Technicians in Maine) provide one on one and small group instruction to assist with this workload. In previous iterations of Math4ME, special educators were the targeted participants and would share their learning with their paraprofessionals. To strengthen the effects of Math4ME on student learning, the Math4ME stakeholders and team decided that the special education teachers’ paraprofessionals should also participate in the training and coaching. This gives the paraprofessional access to the training firsthand, provides a place to share in their learning and has a greater chance of being presented consistently to students.

Coaching continues to be a strength of Math4ME. To support this important element of the programming and to provide sustainability, professional learning communities (PLCs) have been added to the project. Each special educator and paraprofessional team will be paired with other teams to apply elements of the training to their practice and examine the results in these small groups hosted initially with a Math4ME coach. The goal of the PLCs is to create a safe place for conversations about mathematical practices and do encourage the groups to eventually add other teachers from their schools to join in the conversations and create interest in Math4ME.

Family engagement has not been a focus of Math4ME in the past and the stakeholders and team identified this as an area of focus for the updated version of the project. The Maine Parent Federation (MPF) meets regularly with the Math4ME team to assist with the development of Math4ME family communications. The goal of the work with MPF is to assist with moving from family communications to engagement with a final goal of developing partnerships with families and caregivers.

The previous Maine statewide math test has not shown improvement in student learning. Maine DOE has identified two possible contributing factors to this finding. Comparisons are being done within schools between Math4ME classes and classes with the teachers not in Math4ME. Our survey shows that coaches and teachers are reporting that they are sharing the resources with teachers that are not in Math4ME. In this case, proficiency may not differ substantially when comparing students taught by Math4ME teachers and those not taught by Math4ME teachers. Additionally, in the first three years of the program, the Maine statewide math test was used. It is administered at grade placement level. However, the average percentage of special education teachers’ students one or more mathematics grade levels below grade placement is 89%-97%. Therefore, the Maine statewide math test that has been used may not be a sensitive instrument for showing improvement for students at lower learning levels (below grade level). With stakeholder input, the decision was made that the assessment will been changed to NWEA, which is adaptive and tests students near their learning level, and that the proficiency gap between students with disabilities and all students will be assessed in the future (FFY2021).

**Progress toward the SiMR**

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages)*.***

**Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 45.83% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 45.83% | 47.83% | 49.83% | 51.83% | 53.83% | 55.83% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of math proficient students with disabilities in the LEAs engaged in Math4ME professional development.** | **Total number of students with disabilities in the LEAs engaged in Math4ME professional development.** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 6,136 | 13,389 |  | 45.83% | 45.83% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.**

Maine began using a new statewide math assessment (NWEA) in the 2020-2021 school year. Because the statewide assessment changed, proficiency rates based on the new statewide assessment for FFY2020 constitute a new baseline. However, the NWEA administration in 2020-21 was a field test, and modifications to the method of scaling and benchmarking to determine proficiency are expected for the FFY2021 assessment. Therefore, Maine plans to reset the baseline proficiency rate in FFY2021 and will reconsider targets, with stakeholder input, based on FFY2021 baseline.

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR**.

Math scores are scaled and benchmarked to indicate proficiency levels and collected from all LEAs using a state-wide data system. The number of math proficient students with disabilities in grades 3–8 is divided by the total number of 3–8 grade students with disabilities and is multiplied by 100 to yield a proficiency percentage.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

2020-21 End of Year/Post-training Teacher Survey:
Perceptions of coaching supports, trainings, and implementation practices were investigated through surveys conducted near the end of the school year. The response rate was 95% (n=18) of the 19 teachers in the program. The non-responding teacher had been reassigned to a non-math teaching position. Seventy-six percent of the cohort felt the October workshop was very useful or extremely useful. The December workshop was seen was very useful or extremely useful by 62% of the participants. In each of the four National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) Principles to Action practice areas, 89%-94% of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that they were better prepared to implement the practice. The vast majority of teachers (93%) felt their involvement with Math4ME had a positive impact on their students. Teachers also indicated they felt that their students had more confidence and a better understanding of mathematical learning. They reported that students were more comfortable having math conversations and that students also enjoyed the games and activities.

 2020-21 Coach Survey:
Coaches’ perspectives on the support they provided was obtained through an online survey. All four coaches responded to the survey. All coaches reported doing some coaching and teacher observations virtually. As in previous years, the area where coaches felt teachers gave the most emphasis was the practice area of helping students use and connect mathematical representations. The coaches noted that this year’s teachers differed from prior years’ teachers by being forced to adopt remote learning technology. Coaches felt they were making use of online representations and became more creative in their teaching. As in all prior years, coaches felt Math4ME had a positive effect on student learning. They felt the program contributed to increased student engagement and mathematical learning. All coaches indicated that they shared their Math4ME experiences with other teachers who were not in the program. Half of the coaches (n=2) felt their sharing with other teachers had somewhat affected the other teachers’ instruction. The other two coaches felt teachers not in Math4ME were very much affected or greatly affected. In an open-ended question, the effect on other teachers was seen by two teachers as primarily through their seminars with the other teachers.

2020-21 Fidelity-of-Practice Classroom Observations:
Classroom observations were conducted by the math coaches at one or two points in the school year. Teachers were scored on 2-3 indicators of practice using the Fidelity-of-Practice Rubric. Data from the observations provide in sight in how the NCTM principles were implemented. The four instructional areas are: establish mathematics goals to focus learning, use and connect mathematical representations, build procedural fluency from conceptual understanding, and implement tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving. There was observed improvement in implementing the principles between the initial and final observation in all instructional areas.

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any data quality issues, unrelated to COVID-19, specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.**

The previous Maine statewide math assessment has not shown improvement in student learning. Maine DOE discussed potential contributing factors for this finding with stakeholders. One potential factor that was discussed is the fact that one of the analyses consists of a within-school proficiency comparisons of Math4ME classes and classes with the teachers not in Math4ME. Surveys show that coaches and teachers are reporting that they are sharing the resources with teachers that are not in Math4ME. In this case, proficiency may not differ substantially when comparing students taught by Math4ME teachers and those not taught by Math4ME teachers. An additional potential factor is that the Maine statewide math assessment that has been used is administered at grade placement level. It has been found, however, that the average percentage of special education teachers’ students who are one or more mathematics grade levels below grade placement is 89%-97%. Therefore, the Maine statewide math assessment that has been used may not be a sensitive instrument for showing improvement for students at lower learning levels (below grade level). Based on discussions with stakeholders, the decision was made that the assessment will been changed to Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP), which is adaptive and tests students near their learning level, and that the proficiency gap between students with disabilities and all students will be assessed beginning in FFY2021. Additionally, the Math4ME team is working with MEPRI to explore if more detailed NWEA math subtests will be accessible to maximize the sensitivity and specificity of the instruments used to evaluate student learning based on the Math4ME program.

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State’s current evaluation plan.**

https://www.maine.gov/doe/sites/maine.gov.doe/files/inline-files/Outcomes%2C%20Measures%20and%20Evaluation%20Plan%202021.xlsx\_3.pdf

**Is the State’s evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

University of Maine Personnel & External Evaluators

Maine Education Policy Research Institute (MEPRI)
Maine DOE maintains its contract with MEPRI to serve as the external evaluator of the SSIP. MEPRI is a University of Maine research center with two decades of experience providing research, program evaluation, and policy analysis to Maine schools, government and community agencies, and the Maine State Legislature. Based on this long relationship, MEPRI personnel have detailed knowledge of Maine's educational data and initiatives. The SSIP evaluation continues to be coordinated by Janet Fairman, Ph.D., an Associate Research Professor of Education at the University of Maine, and Craig Mason, Ph.D. a Professor of Education and Applied Quantitative Methods at the University of Maine. Based on the combined expertise of MEPRI researchers to conduct and communicate quantitative analyses, including value-added and growth models, qualitative methods, and survey design, their continued involvement significantly benefits the Math4ME initiative.

Garrett Consulting
Garrett Consulting services were used to develop a State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) proposal for Math4ME. Maine received the 2021 grant and has contracted with Garrett Consulting to serve as the external evaluator for the grant. To prepare for grant reports, the Math4ME team meets regularly with Garrett Consulting to examine objectives, goals, assessments and data collection. Activity logs, evidence-based professional development charts and implementation checklists are a few of the valuable tools developed with the consultants.

Math Trainers & Coaches

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, all Math4ME trainings continued to be remote, synchronous and interactive. The former Maine DOE Math Specialist, Cheryl Tobey, now with the Maine Math and Science Alliance (MMSA) has returned to serve as the Math4ME project lead trainer. She continues to bring a wealth of experience and math content and pedagogical expertise to the Maine DOE and continues to collaborate with Math4ME lead coach, Nancy Lander. Nancy co-led the training for all cohorts and continues to support LEA coaches and coaches Math4ME teachers. This fall, an additional coach with math expertise, Chelsey Fay, from MMSA joined the Math4ME team.

Math4ME Stakeholder Group

The Math4ME stakeholder group consists of special educators, special education directors, school administrators and representatives from the Maine Department of Education, Maine Math & Science Alliance, the external evaluators and Maine Parent Federation. A member of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report State Advisory Panel and higher-education faculty are also a part of the group. This year additional family members and past Math4ME participants will added to expand the expertise and perspectives of the group. This group has also started meeting quarterly versus yearly to deepen the engagement in Math4ME programming and decision making.

LEA Teachers

In 2021-2022, Math4ME shifted to a focus on rural special educators and the paraprofessionals that work with them. This new cohort is identified as Math4ME Cohort A. This year started with 13 educator and paraprofessional pairs in the most rural areas of Maine. The participating Local Education Agencies (LEAs) were selected based on an application process that assessed readiness and capacity to institute evidence-based improvement practices in teaching mathematics.

Federal Technical Assistance

Maine continued to benefit greatly from the support and assistance of OSEP-funded technical assistance centers. The IDEA Data Center and other agencies have provided indispensable guidance, consultation, and coordination through all steps of Maine's SSIP development and implementation.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

Accountability/Monitoring
External evaluation: The addition of Garrett Consulting to the external evaluation team for the SPDG will strengthen Math4ME’s accountability and monitoring. Strengthening the identification of the project’s goals, outcomes and approaches to measurement will support system change to assist with future work to scale up Math4ME.

Professional Development
Trainers & Coaches: Cheryl Tobey and Nancy Lander have years of experience working with Maine educators and both have significant expertise in mathematical training and coaching. The professional development that they provide will lead to student learning and therefore achievement of the SiMR.The training and coaching they provide will lead to educators’ increased knowledge of fundamental concepts and pedagogy, improved skill of teachers in teaching fundamental concepts in mathematics, increase the number of students with disabilities exposed to research-based teaching practices and will increase proficiency in math for students with disabilities in grades 3-8. This will be evident in NWEA student assessment data, teacher surveys, and fidelity of practice data.

 Math4ME Cohort A Teachers & Paraprofessionals: By focusing on special educator and paraprofessional teams, students will be exposed to research-based teaching practices in fundamental concepts in math consistently. This will support the achievement of the SiMR. The teams’ understanding of math best practices will increase proficiency in math for students with disabilities in their classrooms.

Governance
Stakeholder Group: The continued guidance and accountability by the stakeholder group will support sustainability.

Technical Assistance
OSEP-funded technical assistance centers and their staff provide technical assistance to support Math4ME program implementation and sustainability. Support is frequently provided by the IDEA Data Center and the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI).

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved*.***

Administrator Sessions: Research demonstrates that administrator support is vital to program implementation. In previous Math4ME years, an administrator session was provided which included an overview of the Math4ME program. Starting in the 2021-2022 school year, there are a minimum of three administrator meetings. These meetings include an overview of the program, highlights of training and coaching, interactive math activities and ways that the administrators can support their special educator and paraprofessional teams. Administrator support will aid in participant retention and sustainability of the project.

Family Engagement: In the past, Math4ME educators worked with students using concepts and practices learned in the training and it was up to them to decide how to share their instructional practices with their students’ families and caregivers. Beginning this year, the Math4ME team in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation is developing family engagement tools for participating educators and paraprofessionals. These tools start with simple communications sent home as postcards with an example of a math routine and their student’s work sample. The goal is to progress from communications to engagement to family partnerships.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Maine recently announced that the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) suite of assessments developed by Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) will be used for the 2021 state assessment tool. The Maine DOE will renew its contract with MEPRI to serve as the external evaluator of the SSIP. The Math4ME team has met with MEPRI associates to discuss additional student achievement measures that may be highlighted in components of this new assessment. The components of this assessment will be more sensitive to gains made by special education students in the Math4ME program.

State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) - The state of Maine has been awarded a SPDG for 2021-2026 for the Math4ME work.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

Math4ME training is grounded in the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM)?Mathematics Teaching Practices, which can be found here: https://www.nctm.org/uploadedFiles/Standards\_and\_Positions/PtAExecutiveSummary.pdf .? This training includes hands-on activities and interactive professional learning experiences that allow participants to gain a deeper understanding of core mathematics concepts and strategies. Program content includes computational fluency operations; problem-solving skills and processes; and assessment, diagnostic probes, and formative feedback. It includes Math4ME professional learning sessions, Professional Learning Community (PLC), and Coaching.

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

Professional Learning Sessions
Math4ME training completely shifted to remote, synchronous interactive professional learning experiences. Professional learning sessions were held during the summer and the fall. The sessions focused on training teachers of grades 3-8 special education students in the fundamental concepts in math content and pedagogy with a focus on the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) principles and standards. Math4ME trainers/coaches also provide analysis of formative assessment results with teachers, methods of evaluating students for math levels to report strengths and needs, and other supports as requested by the teacher. Numerous resources relevant to math content and pedagogy may be found on the Math4ME Padlet website, including learning trajectory resources, formative assessment tools, and full research articles on evidence-based teaching practices.

Professional Learning Communities (PLC)
Each special educator and paraprofessional team will be paired with other teams to apply elements of the training to their practice and examine the results in these small groups hosted initially with a Math4ME coach. The goal of the PLCs is to create a safe place for conversations about mathematical practices and to encourage the groups to eventually add other teachers from their schools to join in the conversations and create interest in Math4ME. The smaller group interactive activities further support collaboration, feedback and reflection. Learning activities in both PL and PLC sessions use a range of modes including interactive sorts, reviewing student work, learning through video cases, and engaging in mathematics.

Coaching
Participants will engage in two observation cycles with one of the Math4ME coaches. In addition to coaching, participants are supported with ad-hoc assistance from the Lead Coach and LEA-Level Coaches and are provided with numerous technical assistance resources. Coaches provide opportunities for conversations about mathematic instructional practices and informal observations with feedback. The Math4ME padlet also contains preconference coaching tools, coaching visit overview, and other materials used by the Coaches and Math4ME teachers for the coaching visits. It can be accessed at https://padlet.com/MathProbes/Math4ME2021CohortA. The continued practice of developing teachers’ conceptual understanding of mathematics and mathematics instruction through professional learning and coaching will lead to a change in classroom practices. The teachers’ advanced mathematical understanding and pedagogy will lead to gains in student learning.

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

In the past Math4ME Professional Learning Sessions were held in the summer and fall only. Now these sessions will continue throughout the school year. By shortening the sessions and extending them throughout the year, educators and paraprofessionals will have time in between sessions to implement math strategies and routines. In between the shortened sessions, PLCs meet. In these meetings participants bring examples of their practices to share and discuss with the group. This time of reflection on practice will strengthen the participants understanding of the math principles which will lead to the improved skills of special educators in teaching fundamental concepts in math. Coaching will further support the educators’ understanding and implementation skills.

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

2020-21 Fidelity-of-Practice Classroom Observations:
As noted above with respect to additional data that informed progress toward the SIMR, classroom observations were conducted by the math coaches at one or two points in the school year. Teachers were scored on 2-3 indicators of practice using the Fidelity-of-Practice Rubric. Data from the observations provide insight into how the NCTM principles were implemented. The four instructional areas are: establish mathematics goals to focus learning, use and connect mathematical representations, build procedural fluency from conceptual understanding, and implement tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving. There was observed improvement in implementing the principles between the initial and final observation in all instructional areas.

2021-2022 Fidelity-of-Practice Classroom Observations:
Due to the stresses of the pandemic, educator workforce shortages and switching from remote to in person back to remote instruction, the Math4ME team gave participants options for the classroom observation in the fall. Educators and paraprofessionals were given the option of participating in an observation, a professional support session with a coach or to share a collection of student work that demonstrated the mathematics principals addressed in the learning sessions. Educators and paraprofessionals chose a variety of the options. This option was presented and accepted our OSEP SPDG project lead.

In the spring, the participants will return to classroom observations which will be held remotely. iPads and SWIVL cameras were purchased to permit coaches to observe in rural classrooms. Teachers and paraprofessionals will be scored on 2-3 indicators of practice using the Fidelity-of-Practice Rubric. The new Cohort 4 was observed twice during the school year and the returning Cohort 3 was observed once. There was observed improvement in implementing the principles in between the initial and second observation of Cohort 4 in all NTCM Principles to Action instructional areas.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

2020-21 End of Year / Post-training Teacher Survey:
As noted above with respect to additional data that informed progress toward the SIMR, perceptions of coaching supports, trainings, and implementation practices were investigated through surveys conducted near the end of the school year. The response rate was 95% (n=18) of the 19 teachers in the program. The non-responding teacher had been reassigned to a non-math teaching position. Seventy-six percent of the cohort felt the October workshop was very useful or extremely useful. The December workshop was seen was very useful or extremely useful by 62% of the participants. In each of the four National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) Principles to Action practice areas, 89%-94% of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that they were better prepared to implement the practice. The vast majority of teachers (93%) felt their involvement with Math4ME had a positive impact on their students. Teachers also indicated they felt that their students had more confidence and a better understanding of mathematical learning. They reported that students were more comfortable having math conversations and that students also enjoyed the games and activities.

2020-21 Coach Survey:
Coaches’ perspectives on the support they provided was obtained through an online survey. All four coaches responded to the survey. All coaches reported doing some coaching and teacher observations virtually. As in previous years, the area where coaches felt teachers gave the most emphasis was the practice area of helping students use and connect mathematical representations. The coaches noted that this year’s teachers differed from prior years’ teachers by being forced to adopt remote learning technology. Coaches felt they were making use of online representations and became more creative in their teaching. As in all prior years, coaches felt Math4ME had a positive effect on student learning. They felt the program contributed to increased student engagement and mathematical learning. All coaches indicated that they shared their Math4ME experiences with other teachers who were not in the program. Half of the coaches (n=2) felt their sharing with other teachers had somewhat affected the other teachers’ instruction. The other two coaches felt teachers not in Math4ME were very much affected or greatly affected. In an open-ended question, the effect on other teachers was seen by two teachers as primarily through their seminars with the other teachers.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Math4ME training will continue to be predominantly remote, however, next year there is a plan to start with a two day in-person training. This will give the trainers time to help participants become familiar with the technology before shifting to remote. This will also allow time for trainers and coaches to get to know the participants and build rapport. With other proposed infrastructure changes, this should increase retention of participants leading to a greater influence on student outcomes. PLCs will continue as planned, but there will be an increase in the number of coaches which will lead to greater retention and sustainability.

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public throughout 2020-2021.
This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).
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. 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 through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include 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 vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.
Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings throughout 2020-2021. SAP members were informed of the development of the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.
Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021. The MADSEC conferences included sessions on the reauthorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.
Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

 **Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

Since the last SSIP reporting period, the Math4ME team continues to hold multiple small group meetings with both internal and external stakeholders, communicates through emails and held a full stakeholder meeting in December of 2021 to provide updates, seek guidance and make plans for the future of Math4ME. The concerns of stakeholders and the Maine DOE’s plan for improvements based on this guidance are outlined in the next section of this report. Full stakeholder meetings will be held quarterly for the 2021-2022 school year.

To continue stakeholder engagement, meetings will remain online to permit stakeholders from throughout Maine to attend. During the most recent meeting, the Math4ME trainer led participants through a variety of activities and discussions designed to showcase various components of the updated training and fidelity measures while providing a conceptual framework for stakeholders. Additionally, the external evaluator presented and discussed the evaluation results from the Cohort 4 data collected from surveys, interviews, fidelity checks, and student assessment results. Because the 2020–2021 was year five of the project, the stakeholders were presented with the updates decided upon during the last stakeholder gathering. Stakeholders will continue to be a critical component in providing guidance to the Maine DOE for future implementation and scale-up efforts. To strengthen this component, family members and past Math4ME participants will be added to the group.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

In past meetings, the stakeholders expressed concerns about the scope of the training, assessment measures, and sustainability. Each of these areas have been addressed by the Maine DOE through the revised Math4ME programming.

Over the past five years the Math4ME trainings have focused on content that meets the needs of special education students in grades 3-8 and a formative assessment tool. The stakeholder group recommended pairing down the content and the grade bands to focus and intensify the intervention. In response to this, beginning in the fall of 2021, Math4ME now focuses on educators and their paraprofessionals who work with students who are functioning at developmental grade levels between third and fifth grade. With the change in grade band, the content presented will focus on computational fluency as it aligns with the NCTM principles and standards.

As mentioned earlier, the previous Maine statewide math assessment has not shown improvement in student learning. Maine DOE discussed potential contributing factors for this finding with stakeholders. One potential factor that was discussed is the fact that one of the analyses consists of a within-school proficiency comparisons of Math4ME classes and classes with the teachers not in Math4ME. Surveys show that coaches and teachers are reporting that they are sharing the resources with teachers that are not in Math4ME. In this case, proficiency may not differ substantially when comparing students taught by Math4ME teachers and those not taught by Math4ME teachers. An additional potential factor is that the Maine statewide math assessment that has been used is administered at grade placement level. It has been found, however, that the average percentage of special education teachers’ students who are one or more mathematics grade levels below grade placement is 89%-97%. Therefore, the Maine statewide math assessment that has been used may not be a sensitive instrument for showing improvement for students at lower learning levels (below grade level). Based on discussions with stakeholders, the decision was made that the assessment will been changed to Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP), which is adaptive and tests students near their learning level, and that the proficiency gap between students with disabilities and all students will be assessed beginning in FFY2021. Additionally, the Math4ME team is working with MEPRI to explore if more detailed NWEA math subtests will be accessible to maximize the sensitivity and specificity of the instruments used to evaluate student learning based on the Math4ME program.

To address sustainability, the cohorts will include special educator and paraprofessional pairs. The pair of educators will support one another’s practice and students will have more consistent Math4ME based instruction. These pairs of educators will work in a small group with a coach to create a community of Math4ME practitioners with the goal of adding other educators to this group from within the grade level, the school, and eventually the entire district.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

Educator workforce issues: As much of the nation, Maine has been working to address workforce shortages and the needs of educators. Due to the pandemic and workforce issues, maintaining participant numbers has been difficult. To mediate this in the future, the Math4ME team is collaborating with stakeholders to explore options. One option considered is altering recruitment for Math4ME from participant pairs/teams to more of a school-wide initiative with administrators and other educators joining the team. This will lead to retention in the program and increase sustainability.

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

## 17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 17 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not provide any data, aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR), for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

The State must provide a link or narrative description of the current Theory of Action.

## 17 - Required Actions

# Certification

**Instructions**

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

**Certify**

**I certify that I am the 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.**

**Select the certifier’s role:**

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:**

Erin H Frazier

**Title:**

State Director of Special Services Birth to 22

**Email:**

erin.frazier@maine.gov

**Phone:**

2076246713

**Submitted on:**

04/28/22 2:10:30 PM