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# Introduction

**Instructions**

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

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

Child Development Services (CDS) is a quasi-governmental agency responsible for the implementation of Part C and Part B 619. As described in the state stature: The Maine Department of Education (MDOE) Commissioner “shall establish and supervise the state intermediate educational unit. The state intermediate educational unit is established as a body corporate and politic and as a public instrumentality of the State for the purpose of conducting child find activities as provided in 20 United States Code, Section 1412 (a)(3) for children from birth to under 6 years of age, ensuring the provision of early intervention services for eligible children from birth to under 3 years of age and ensuring a free, appropriate public education for eligible children at least 3 years of age and under 6 years of age.” MRSA 20-A§7209(3)

CDS, an intermediate educational unit (IEU), has nine regional locations that serve as system points of entry for Part C and 619 and one state office. The state CDS office maintains a central data management system, system-wide policies and procedures, system-wide contracts for service providers, and centralized fiscal services.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

The Maine Child Information Network Connection System, known as CINC, is the central data management system utilized by the site offices, contractor agencies, service providers, and the CDS staff. This system tracks children in every phase of the CDS program and provides critical data at the state, regional site and provider agency levels. After the launch of CINC in July of 2016, new functions and screens have been continuously added in response to user input as well as changes in policy and procedure. CINC is a dynamic system that continues to be updated and/or modified to meet the data collection and reporting needs of Maine’s CDS.

CINC is internet-based and, therefore, remained accessible to CDS staff and contracted providers throughout the entire reporting period. Although the COVID-19 pandemic did not impact data validity, reliability, or completeness, it may have negatively affected Maine's overall compliance throughout the last quarter of the reporting period. . In mid-March of 2020, services and evaluations that were being provided through CDS moved from in-person to remote as a result of COVID-19 precautions and, subsequently, stay-at-home orders per the Governor. Even though all regional sites made the transition to remote services and evaluations by early to mid-April of 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic continued to make it more difficult to schedule appointments with families for a variety of reasons: challenges with accessing/using technology, increased family stressors due to children being out of school/childcare, and/or changes in employment status. Additionally, many CDS staff applied for and received benefits under the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (FFCRA) in order to seek medical treatment and/or self-isolate after being diagnosed with COVID-19, care for family members who had tested positive for COVID-19, and/or adhere to quarantining mandates following exposure to someone who had tested positive for COVID-19.

**General Supervision System**

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

CDS implements the General Supervision System for Part C and Part B 619 in Maine that was developed in conjunction with MDOE. Monitoring, findings, corrections and implementation of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and Maine Unified Special Education Regulation (MUSER) are the primary responsibilities for the CDS Data Manager, under the direction of the Part C State Coordinator and State Director of the State Intermediate Educational Unit (IEU).

All regional sites are monitored, provided letter of findings, required to submit corrective action plans and are provided determinations annually. The Commissioner of Education provides certification of the information by submitting the letters of findings. CDS State IEU has adopted the Part B due process procedures and utilizes the MDOE Due Process office to fulfill the requirements of IDEA.

Regional Early Intervention Program Managers (EIPMs) conduct ongoing, regular file and data system reviews using designated tools (e.g., compliance reports from CINC, file audit checklists, etc.) to ensure completeness and accuracy of data on a monthly basis. EIPMs use the data in CINC, combined with ongoing supervision of staff and contracted providers, to identify and resolve site-specific compliance issues as they are identified throughout the year. Additionally, the EIPMs interpret letters of findings and, in conjunction with the Site Director, develop, implement, and monitor corrective action plans at the site-level.

**Technical Assistance System:**

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

The CDS State Director continued to serve as both the Early Intervention Technical Advisor and the Part C Coordinator for FFY 2019. In this dual role, the CDS State Director provided assistance to any and all Part C providers in Maine, as needed or as determined, to ensure compliance with federal Part C indicators and progress toward targets. This position was also responsible for ensuring the Routines-Based Early Intervention (RBEI) model and other evidenced-based practices were implemented with fidelity.

The CDS State Director, in collaboration with Regional Early Intervention Program Managers, continually reviews State Part C data and revises procedures and policies as needed to ensure compliance with and movement toward federal Part C indicators and fidelity to the RBEI model and other evidenced-based practices. This continuous improvement approach results in ongoing data review and timely guidance to the field.

The CDS State Director also works closely with the State 619 Coordinator, the State Data Manager, and Regional Early Intervention Program Managers to ensure that there is an understanding of roles and responsibilities in each program as related to transition and to develop materials to support smooth transition of children who are turning three. The CDS State Director and other State Leadership representatives and site-level leadership representatives also represent CDS on a number of state and local committees, as well as state and local multiagency collaboratives.

CDS accessed technical assistance from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA Center), the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy), and the Infant and Toddler Coordinators Association (ITCA) in the following areas: System of Payments, SPP/APR, SSIP, Part C SPP Indicators 1 and 7, infant mental health, General Supervision, evidence-based practices for infants/toddlers with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), and COVID-19. As a result, CDS provided trainings and updated guidance documents for Service Coordinators and Part C providers in an effort to increase compliance with Indicators 1 and 7. CDS also developed a System of Payments Policy and began offering a parent-implemented version of its Early Start Denver Model (ESDM) program to toddlers with ASD and their families.

**Professional Development System:**

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

In FFY 2019, CDS State Leadership continued to be involved in several new and ongoing statewide and regional initiatives. It continued to provide services via the RBEI model, with continued professional development and associated fidelity assessment measures to the extent possible given the context of COVID-19. All new staff and contracted providers continue to receive initial training on all components of RBEI (e.g., family ecology, child and family needs assessment, participation-based outcomes, routines-based home visits, and collaborative consultation to childcare) with ongoing fidelity checks to ensure all components of RBEI are provided to infants/toddlers and their families with fidelity. Subsequent focused trainings are developed and implemented for individual and/or groups of staff and contracted providers based on the specific needs identified through these ongoing fidelity checks.

Additionally, Early Intervention Program Managers develop and implement site-level trainings and collaborate with outside agencies to provide ongoing professional development specific to the needs of their regional teams. In FFY 2019, professional development opportunities were provided to regional teams by multiple outside agencies including, but not limited to, the Maine Center for Disease Control, Penquis, Adoptive and Foster Families of Maine, Postpartum International, National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI), the Opportunity Alliance, Family Enrichment Council, and Literacy Volunteers of the Waterville Area. State-wide trainings and resources on tele-evaluations and tele-intervention were provided to all staff and contracted providers following the suspension of in-home evaluations and services as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

In September of 2019, two of the Early Intervention Program Managers (EIPMs) traveled to Tuscaloosa, Alabama to attend the Collaborative Consultation to Child Care (CC2CC) Institute. The CC2CC Certification Institute is designed to train trainers in itinerant early intervention/early childhood special education (EI/ECSE) for children in classroom-based programs. The attendees are currently working on developing a state-wide training for all of Maine’s early intervention providers in order to increase their confidence and competence with delivering Early Intervention Services to children whose natural environments are outside of the home (i.e., childcare centers, Early Head Start programs, etc.).

In December of 2019, CDS Part C assumed responsibility for the administration of its Early Start Denver Model (ESDM) services from the University of Maine's Autism Institute for Education and Research (MAIER), hiring several former MAIER staff to coordinate, at the regional site level, professional development, coaching, ongoing fidelity assessment, and ASD-related services in general. This shift will increase the system's capacity to provide evidence-based services to young children with ASD and their families and to expand the range of ASD-specific service to better individualize to child and family needs.

In addition, CDS Part C continued its long-standing collaboration with the Maine Education Center for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (MECDHH), further refining the effective integration of evidence-based practices for infants and toddlers, who are Deaf or hard of hearing, and their families into CDS Routines-Based Early Intervention service delivery model.

With the added catalyst of related legislation, CDS Part C continued to work with MaineCare, the state's Medicare program, to identify ways in which to increase funding to the state's Part C program and to raise awareness of the state's Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic and Treatment (EPSDT) services.

Also in this reporting year, Maine resurrected the Children's Cabinet, a state-level, cross-departmental/cross agency committee tasked with identifying statewide priorities and developing and implementing a multi-year strategic plan addressing Maine's most pressing child-related issues. With input from the State Director/Part C Coordinator, who is a Children's Cabinet staff member, the Children's Cabinet identified increased developmental screening rates - and subsequent referrals to Part C - as a statewide priority and included several screening-related items in its strategic plan. These efforts are anticipated to increase referrals to CDS and its identification rate for infants and toddlers.

**Stakeholder Involvement:**

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

The CDS State IEU utilizes the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) including revisions and setting targets. In addition, the SICC also discusses Part C trends and identifies priorities for Maine’s Part C program. The SICC is scheduled to meet on a quarterly basis.

CDS also works closely with regional site leadership and staff, contracted providers, and other State entities such as the Maine Education Center for Deaf/Hard of Hearing, the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research, Maine Families Home Visiting, Maine Center for Disease Control’s Children with Special Healthcare Needs, Child Welfare, and Early Head Start. These collaborations allow for the pooling of resources and increase stakeholder engagement with Part C. As a result, those stakeholders impact, both directly and indirectly, Maine’s performance on federal indicators.

Additionally, CDS continues to be involved in a number of initiatives in Maine where information is gathered from and shared in relation to Early Intervention Services and the success and challenges the State faces for infants/toddlers and their families. Like the SICC, these initiatives have cross sector representation. Some of these initiatives include the Early Intervention Working Group, the Early Childhood Consultation Program, and the Substance Exposed Infants and Maternal Substance Use Steering Committee.

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

YES

**Reporting to the Public:**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2018 performance of each EIS Program located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2018 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State’s SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.**

Reports to the public on the performance of the regional CDS sites (EIS programs) on Indicators 1-8 for FFY 2018 are posted under the "Public Reporting" section of the CDS website at https://www.maine.gov/doe/node/977, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A). A complete copy of Maine's SPP/APR for FFY 2018 is available under the "State Performance Plan" section of the CDS website at https://www.maine.gov/doe/node/977.

In accordance with the required actions identified by OSEP in Maine's FFY 2018 SPP/APR, reports to the public on the performance of the regional CDS sites (EIS programs) on Indicators 1-8 for FFY 2017 (as well as Indicators 5 and 6 from FFY 2016) are posted under the "Public Reporting" section on the CDS website at https://www.maine.gov/doe/node/977. Also, Maine's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) for FFY 2018, including all attachments, is available to the public under the heading "C-11: State Systemic Improvement Plan" on the CDS website at https://www.maine.gov/doe/node/977.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State has not publicly reported on the FFY 2017 (July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018) performance of each EIS program or provider located in the State on the targets in the State’s performance plan as required by sections 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) and 642 of IDEA.  With its FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported to the public on the performance of each early intervention service program or provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR for FFY 2017. In addition, the State must report with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR, how and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2018 performance of each early intervention service program or provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR.

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP’s coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State’s capacity to improve its SiMR data.

OSEP notes that one or more of the attachments included in the State’s FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education’s IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

The State's IDEA Part C determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2020 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.
The State must report, with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

## Intro - OSEP Response

The State did not provide verification that the attachment it included in its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission is in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508.

The State's determinations for both 2019 and 2020 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to sections 616(e)(1) and 642 of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 303.704(a), OSEP's June 23, 2020 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

## Intro - Required Actions

# Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

**Instructions**

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 91.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.17% | 99.03% | 93.26% | 93.17% | 97.38% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner** | **Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,222 | 1,285 | 97.38% | 100% | 95.88% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Slippage with this indicator was due to staff/provider shortages at 4 of the regional sites, scheduling difficulties with contracted providers who have limited availability to CDS, regional site closures due to inclement weather, and errors with CINC data entry by Service Coordinators and Part C providers.

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

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

10

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

Maine's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services is no later than 30 days from the parental consent of initiation of services or, in certain individualized cases, the start date for the service that was agreed upon by the IFSP Team, including the parent, as listed on the IFSP.

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

State database

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

7/1/2019 to 6/30/2020

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

This data was collected for all CDS EIS programs through the statewide database, CINC, and it includes all children with IFSPs who received EI services for the full reporting period.

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

In addition to the reasons for slippage identified above, the COVID-19 pandemic was a significant reason for delay due to CDS staff working remotely with decreased levels of direct supervision, CDS staff and families receiving Part C services facing COVID-related stressors (i.e., children at home while working remotely, changes in employment status of others in the home, needing to support remote learning for school-aged children, etc.), and lack of access to and experience with technology needed to provide/participate in Part C services remotely.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**FFY 2018 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 the findings of noncompliance from FFY 2018 corrected, the CDS State IEU verified that the 6 regional CDS sites with incidents of noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements specific to the timely provision of services. Specifically, the CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from the state-wide database (CINC), regional CDS site self-assessments, and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The findings of noncompliance were verified as corrected when all 6 of the regional CDS sites with incidents of noncompliance had achieved 100% compliance in the timely provision of services for one month.

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

The CDS State IEU verified that the 20 individual cases of noncompliance across 6 regional sites which occurred in FFY 2018 had been corrected. All affected infants and toddlers whose services were not provided in a timely manner did receive those services, although the provision of those services was late.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine the State's criteria for “timely” receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated). The State reported, "Maine's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services is no later than 30 days from the parental consent of initiation of services or, in certain individualized cases, the start date for the service that was agreed upon by the IFSP Team, including the parent, as listed on the IFSP." It is not clear how "certain individualized cases" are being applied in determining the State's criteria for "timely" receipt of services.

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 89.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target>= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Data | 99.89% | 98.79% | 98.40% | 99.23% | 99.36% |

**Targets**

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

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDS State IEU utilizes the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) including revisions and setting targets. In addition, the SICC also discusses Part C trends and identifies priorities for Maine’s Part C program. The SICC is scheduled to meet on a quarterly basis.

CDS also works closely with regional site leadership and staff, contracted providers, and other State entities such as the Maine Education Center for Deaf/Hard of Hearing, the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research, Maine Families Home Visiting, Maine Center for Disease Control’s Children with Special Healthcare Needs, Child Welfare, and Early Head Start. These collaborations allow for the pooling of resources and increase stakeholder engagement with Part C. As a result, those stakeholders impact, both directly and indirectly, Maine’s performance on federal indicators.

Additionally, CDS continues to be involved in a number of initiatives in Maine where information is gathered from and shared in relation to Early Intervention Services and the success and challenges the State faces for infants/toddlers and their families. Like the SICC, these initiatives have cross sector representation. Some of these initiatives include the Early Intervention Working Group, the Early Childhood Consultation Program, and the Substance Exposed Infants and Maternal Substance Use Steering Committee.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/08/2020 | Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings | 1,002 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/08/2020 | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | 1,011 |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings** | **Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,002 | 1,011 | 99.36% | 95.00% | 99.11% | Met Target | No Slippage |

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

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

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

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

 C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:**

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

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

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 3 - Indicator Data

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

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDS State IEU utilizes the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) including revisions and setting targets. In addition, the SICC also discusses Part C trends and identifies priorities for Maine’s Part C program. The SICC is scheduled to meet on a quarterly basis.

CDS also works closely with regional site leadership and staff, contracted providers, and other State entities such as the Maine Education Center for Deaf/Hard of Hearing, the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research, Maine Families Home Visiting, Maine Center for Disease Control’s Children with Special Healthcare Needs, Child Welfare, and Early Head Start. These collaborations allow for the pooling of resources and increase stakeholder engagement with Part C. As a result, those stakeholders impact, both directly and indirectly, Maine’s performance on federal indicators.

Additionally, CDS continues to be involved in a number of initiatives in Maine where information is gathered from and shared in relation to Early Intervention Services and the success and challenges the State faces for infants/toddlers and their families. Like the SICC, these initiatives have cross sector representation. Some of these initiatives include the Early Intervention Working Group, the Early Childhood Consultation Program, and the Substance Exposed Infants and Maternal Substance Use Steering Committee.

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A1** | 2008 | Target>= | 53.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% | 54.00% |
| **A1** | 51.50% | Data | 55.40% | 59.52% | 64.03% | 64.24% | 65.18% |
| **A2** | 2008 | Target>= | 41.00% | 41.00% | 41.00% | 41.00% | 42.00% |
| **A2** | 39.70% | Data | 60.13% | 44.03% | 41.67% | 39.26% | 35.17% |
| **B1** | 2008 | Target>= | 60.00% | 60.00% | 60.00% | 60.00% | 61.00% |
| **B1** | 59.10% | Data | 67.73% | 71.69% | 73.59% | 67.99% | 71.12% |
| **B2** | 2008 | Target>= | 27.00% | 27.00% | 27.00% | 27.00% | 28.00% |
| **B2** | 25.60% | Data | 35.56% | 27.35% | 29.94% | 31.13% | 27.11% |
| **C1** | 2008 | Target>= | 53.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% | 54.00% |
| **C1** | 51.50% | Data | 67.24% | 67.97% | 68.34% | 70.54% | 70.23% |
| **C2** | 2008 | Target>= | 38.00% | 38.00% | 38.00% | 38.00% | 39.00% |
| **C2** | 37.20% | Data | 63.09% | 45.91% | 41.36% | 39.81% | 33.96% |

**Targets**

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

 **FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

759

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

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 4 | 0.53% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 204 | 26.88% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 299 | 39.39% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 129 | 17.00% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 123 | 16.21% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 428 | 636 | 65.18% | 54.00% | 67.30% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 252 | 759 | 35.17% | 42.00% | 33.20% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

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

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

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

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 4 | 0.53% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 203 | 26.75% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 375 | 49.41% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 127 | 16.73% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 50 | 6.59% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 502 | 709 | 71.12% | 61.00% | 70.80% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 177 | 759 | 27.11% | 28.00% | 23.32% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

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

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

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

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 6 | 0.79% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 186 | 24.51% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 330 | 43.48% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 164 | 21.61% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 73 | 9.62% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 494 | 686 | 70.23% | 54.00% | 72.01% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 237 | 759 | 33.96% | 39.00% | 31.23% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

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

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

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

| **Question** | **Number** |
| --- | --- |
| The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State’s part C exiting 618 data | 989 |
| The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program. | 347 |

| **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 form has been built into the statewide data system (CINC) with validations to ensure every child has a COS form on file at entry and at exit from Part C services if they have been in services for more than six months.

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

In addition to the factors described above, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic may have led to slippage in the percent of infants and toddlers functioning within age expectations in all three categories when exiting Part C. Given that outside agencies that provide services to infant/toddlers and their families have not been able to go into homes during the COVID-19 pandemic, combined with lower rates of children receiving well child checks through their primary care physicians, there has been a significant decrease in developmental screenings statewide and, subsequently, less referrals to Part C. This has yielded a higher percentage of children being referred with established conditions and more significant developmental delays. In addition, Service Coordinators and Part C providers were faced with ongoing challenges in regard to completing accurate COS ratings due to the constraints of conducting evaluations, holding meetings, and providing services remotely. Many families of children in Part C asked to reduce the frequency/intensity of services when in-person services were suspended in March of 2020, leading to infants and toddlers in Part C receiving a lesser amount of intervention per family request. Additionally, the modeling that is typically provided by the Primary Service Provider during visits in the home was much more difficult to provide through a screen and/or by phone without physical proximity to the child/family, making it harder for families to implement suggested strategies to address IFSP outcomes between visits.

## 3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3 - OSEP Response

## 3 - Required Actions

# Indicator 4: Family Involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

A. Know their rights;

B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and

C. Help their children develop and learn.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 4 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2006 | Target>= | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 92.00% |
| A | 76.00% | Data | 97.74% | 96.74% | 96.55% | 94.05% | 95.07% |
| B | 2006 | Target>= | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 92.00% |
| B | 85.00% | Data | 98.19% | 97.65% | 96.55% | 97.62% | 96.48% |
| C | 2006 | Target>= | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 92.00% |
| C | 88.00% | Data | 97.29% | 99.06% | 96.55% | 96.43% | 96.48% |

**Targets**

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

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDS State IEU utilizes the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) including revisions and setting targets. In addition, the SICC also discusses Part C trends and identifies priorities for Maine’s Part C program. The SICC is scheduled to meet on a quarterly basis.

CDS also works closely with regional site leadership and staff, contracted providers, and other State entities such as the Maine Education Center for Deaf/Hard of Hearing, the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research, Maine Families Home Visiting, Maine Center for Disease Control’s Children with Special Healthcare Needs, Child Welfare, and Early Head Start. These collaborations allow for the pooling of resources and increase stakeholder engagement with Part C. As a result, those stakeholders impact, both directly and indirectly, Maine’s performance on federal indicators.

Additionally, CDS continues to be involved in a number of initiatives in Maine where information is gathered from and shared in relation to Early Intervention Services and the success and challenges the State faces for infants/toddlers and their families. Like the SICC, these initiatives have cross sector representation. Some of these initiatives include the Early Intervention Working Group, the Early Childhood Consultation Program, and the Substance Exposed Infants and Maternal Substance Use Steering Committee.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The number of families to whom surveys were distributed | 1,555 |
| Number of respondent families participating in Part C  | 154 |
| A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 145 |
| A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 154 |
| B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 147 |
| B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 154 |
| C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 147 |
| C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 154 |

| **Measure** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2) | 95.07% | 92.00% | 94.16% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2) | 96.48% | 92.00% | 95.45% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2) | 96.48% | 92.00% | 95.45% | Met Target | No Slippage |

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

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

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

Analyses of representativeness for race/ethnicity, primary language, age of the infant/toddler, and geographic location in the state were conducted, and respondent data was found to be representative of the overall population of infants/toddlers and families enrolled in the Part C program in FYY 2019.

The race/ethnicity of the infants/toddlers receiving Part C services in FFY 2019 fell into the following categories: 86.15% White, 4.25% Black or African American, 2.37% Hispanic/Latino, 2.08% Asian, 0.4% American Indian or Alaska Native, 0.1% Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and 4.65% two or more races. English was identified as the primary language for 98.25% of the families of the infants/toddlers enrolled in the Part C program. Spanish was the primary language for 0.68% of families with an additional 1.07% identifying their primary language as “Other.” Most children in the Part program were over the age of 2, with 63.79% being between 2 years and 3 years of age, 28.59% being between 1 year and 2 years of age, and 7.62% being between birth and 1 year of age. The infants/toddlers enrolled in the Part C program resided in all of the 16 counties in Maine, with 10% in Androscoggin, 5% in Aroostook, 24% in Cumberland, 2% in Franklin, 3% in Hancock, 8% in Kennebec, 3% in Knox, 3% in Lincoln, 3% in Oxford, 6% in Penobscot, 1% in Piscataquis, 2% in Sagadahoc, 2% in Somerset, 3% in Waldo, 2% in Washington, and 23% in York.

Like the demographics of the overall population of infants/toddlers receiving Part C services in FYY 2019, survey respondents were 88.86% White, 3.78% Black or African American, 1.89% Hispanic/Latino, 1.09% Asian, and 4.38% two or more races. English was the primary language of 98.75% of the families who responded to the survey. Spanish was the primary language for 0.75% of survey respondents, with an additional 0.5% identifying their primary language as “Other.” Most of the families who responded to the survey had children who were over the age of 2, with 61.83% being between 2 years and 3 years of age, 32.67% being between 1 year and 2 years of age, and 5.50% being between birth and 1 year of age. Survey respondents resided in 15 of the 16 counties in Maine, with 8% in Androscoggin, 2% in Aroostook, 32% in Cumberland, 0% in Franklin, 1% in Hancock, 3% in Kennebec, 3% in Knox, 1% in Lincoln, 1% in Oxford, 5% in Penobscot, 1% in Piscataquis, 3% in Sagadahoc, 4% in Somerset, 2% in Waldo, 1% in Washington, and 33% in York.

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

Data were collected in the Winter of 2020. All families of children receiving services (Part C and 619) through the 9 regional CDS sites in FFY 2019 were sent a parent survey via email containing a link to the electronic survey. Out of the 1,555 families of infants/toddlers that received Part C services, 154 families responded, yielding a response rate of 9.90%. This response rate is lower than previous FFY reporting years, which is likely due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on families as discussed in detail in the Introduction.

## 4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4 - OSEP Response

## 4 - Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 0.65% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 0.82% | 0.82% | 0.82% | 0.82% | 0.83% |
| Data | 0.65% | 0.62% | 0.74% | 0.61% | 0.60% |

**Targets**

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The CDS State IEU utilizes the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) including revisions and setting targets. In addition, the SICC also discusses Part C trends and identifies priorities for Maine’s Part C program. The SICC is scheduled to meet on a quarterly basis.

CDS also works closely with regional site leadership and staff, contracted providers, and other State entities such as the Maine Education Center for Deaf/Hard of Hearing, the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research, Maine Families Home Visiting, Maine Center for Disease Control’s Children with Special Healthcare Needs, Child Welfare, and Early Head Start. These collaborations allow for the pooling of resources and increase stakeholder engagement with Part C. As a result, those stakeholders impact, both directly and indirectly, Maine’s performance on federal indicators.

Additionally, CDS continues to be involved in a number of initiatives in Maine where information is gathered from and shared in relation to Early Intervention Services and the success and challenges the State faces for infants/toddlers and their families. Like the SICC, these initiatives have cross sector representation. Some of these initiatives include the Early Intervention Working Group, the Early Childhood Consultation Program, and the Substance Exposed Infants and Maternal Substance Use Steering Committee.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/08/2020 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs | 77 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin | 06/25/2020 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 | 12,035 |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 77 | 12,035 | 0.60% | 0.83% | 0.64% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Compare your results to the national data**

Maine continues to utilize highly restrictive eligibility criteria (Category C) which limits the percentage of infants and toddlers determined eligible for Part C services. It's current Identification rate from Birth to 1 is below the national identification rate pf 1.37%.

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

Site-level outreach plans to increase Maine's identification rate for Birth to 1 were developed and began to be implemented prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. These targeted outreach efforts included meetings with local primary care physicians, birthing hospitals, neonatal intensive care units, and various other community partners that work with infants and their families.

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 2.89% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 2.81% | 2.81% | 2.81% | 2.81% | 2.90% |
| Data | 2.30% | 2.34% | 2.43% | 2.39% | 2.46% |

**Targets**

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The CDS State IEU utilizes the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) including revisions and setting targets. In addition, the SICC also discusses Part C trends and identifies priorities for Maine’s Part C program. The SICC is scheduled to meet on a quarterly basis.

CDS also works closely with regional site leadership and staff, contracted providers, and other State entities such as the Maine Education Center for Deaf/Hard of Hearing, the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research, Maine Families Home Visiting, Maine Center for Disease Control’s Children with Special Healthcare Needs, Child Welfare, and Early Head Start. These collaborations allow for the pooling of resources and increase stakeholder engagement with Part C. As a result, those stakeholders impact, both directly and indirectly, Maine’s performance on federal indicators.

Additionally, CDS continues to be involved in a number of initiatives in Maine where information is gathered from and shared in relation to Early Intervention Services and the success and challenges the State faces for infants/toddlers and their families. Like the SICC, these initiatives have cross sector representation. Some of these initiatives include the Early Intervention Working Group, the Early Childhood Consultation Program, and the Substance Exposed Infants and Maternal Substance Use Steering Committee.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/08/2020 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs | 1,011 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin | 06/25/2020 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 | 37,101 |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,011 | 37,101 | 2.46% | 2.90% | 2.72% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Compare your results to the national data**

Maine continues to utilize highly restrictive eligibility criteria (Category C) which limits the percentage of infants and toddlers determined eligible for Part C services. It's current Identification rate from Birth Through 2 is below the national identification rate of 3.70%.

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

Site-level outreach plans to increase Maine's identification rate for Birth Through 2 were developed and began to be implemented prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. These targeted outreach efforts included meetings with local primary care physicians, informational packets for childcare providers, and presentations about Part C services to Early Head Start programs, Maine Families Home Visiting, and various other community partners that work with infants/toddlers and their families.

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

**Instructions**

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 94.40% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 74.48% | 81.36% | 98.45% | 91.20% | 95.95% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline** | **Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 624 | 742 | 95.95% | 100% | 92.86% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

A combination of staffing shortages and performance concerns with a Service Coordinator at one of the regional CDS sites is the main reason for slippage with this indicator. Staffing shortages at the site have been alleviated by filling vacant Service Coordinator positions and, in addition, technical assistance and a written plan for improvement, including increased direct supervision and ongoing support, has been put into place for the Service Coordinator with performance concerns. Provider shortages at 4 of the regional sites have also been identified as a reason for slippage with this indicator since they directly affected the sites' ability to conduct eligibility evaluations in a timely manner.

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

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

65

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

State database

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

7/1/2019 to 6/30/2020

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

This data was collected for all CDS EIS programs through the statewide database, CINC, and it includes all children with IFSPs who received EI services for the full reporting period.

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

The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on CDS staff, providers, and families receiving Part C services is another significant reason for delay with this indicator. In addition to the period of time when no eligibility evaluations were conducted and the increased difficulties with scheduling appointments with families as described in the Introduction, CDS staff and providers at all the regional sites experienced a significant increase in cancellations/no shows for evaluations during the pandemic, causing a delay in determining Part C eligibility and, if eligible, the development of an IFSP. Others reasons for delay include the staffing shortages and Service Coordinator performance concerns outlined above as reasons for slippage.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 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 the findings of noncompliance from FFY 2018 corrected, the CDS State IEU verified that the 5 regional CDS sites with incidents of noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements specific to the timely provision of services. Specifically, the CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from the state-wide database (CINC), regional CDS site self-assessments, and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The findings of noncompliance were verified as corrected when all 5 of the regional CDS sites with incidents of noncompliance had achieved 100% compliance with the 45-day timeline for one month.

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

The CDS State IEU verified that the 57 individual cases of noncompliance across 5 regional sites which occurred in FFY 2018 had been corrected and that an assessment, evaluation, and initial IFSP meeting occurred for all affected infants and toddlers, although beyond the 45-day timeline. Individual child records were reviewed and showed that, although late, an IFSP was developed for all 57 children.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

In its description of correction of noncompliance, the State referenced an incorrect regulatory requirement. The State wrote, "...the regulatory requirements specific to the timely provision of services." However, Indicator 7 measures the percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline. Therefore, the State did not demonstrate that the EIS program or provider corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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.

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 69.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

| **Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 739 | 739 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

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

0

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

State database

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

7/1/2019 to 6/30/2020

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

This data was collected for all CDS EIS programs through the statewide database, CINC, and it includes all children with IFSPs who received EI services for the full reporting period.

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

Since CINC is internet-based and, therefore, remained accessible to CDS staff and contracted providers throughout the entire reporting period, it is not felt that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted data validity, reliability, or completeness for this indicator.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **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 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8A - OSEP Response

## 8A - Required Actions

# Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 100.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

| **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 739 | 739 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Number of parents who opted out**

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

0

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

The data for this indicator is collected from Maine's state-wide database (CINC) which requires Service Coordinators at the regional sites to document the date Part C made notification to the SEA and LEA of a toddler potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

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

NO

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

State database

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

7/1/2019 to 6/30/2020

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

This data was collected for all CDS EIS programs through the statewide database, CINC, and it includes all children with IFSPs who received EI services for the full reporting period.

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

Since CINC is internet-based and, therefore, remained accessible to CDS staff and contracted providers throughout the entire reporting period, it is not felt that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted data validity, reliability, or completeness for this indicator.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8B - OSEP Response

## 8B - Required Actions

# Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 87.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 83.85% | 80.24% | 90.45% | 97.45% | 96.63% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

| **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 621 | 739 | 96.63% | 100% | 97.35% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

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

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

22

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

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

77

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

State database

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

7/1/2019 to 6/30/2020

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

This data was collected for all CDS EIS programs through the statewide database, CINC, and it includes all children with IFSPs who received EI services for the full reporting period.

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

In addition to scheduling difficulties with 619 staff, several of the regional sites experienced staffing shortages throughout the majority of the reporting period that prevented transition conferences from being conducted in a timely manner. Additionally, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on CDS staff, contracted providers, and families receiving Part C services described in the Introduction made it challenging for Maine to meet the target for this indicator.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**FFY 2018 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 the findings of noncompliance from FFY 2018 corrected, the CDS State IEU verified that the 4 regional CDS sites with incidents of noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements specific to the timely provision of services. Specifically, the CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from the state-wide database (CINC), regional CDS site self-assessments, and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The findings of noncompliance were verified as corrected when all 4 of the regional CDS sites with incidents of noncompliance had achieved 100% compliance with conducting transition conferences for one month.

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

The CDS State IEU verified that the 22 individual cases of noncompliance across 4 regional sites which occurred in FFY 2018 had been corrected and that a transition conference had been conducted for all affected toddlers, although less than 90 days from their third birthday. Individual child records were reviewed to verify that, although late, a transition conference occurred for all 22 children.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2016 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2016**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Prior to considering the findings of noncompliance from FFY 2016 corrected, the CDS State IEU verified that the 8 regional CDS sites with incidents of noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements specific to the timely provision of services. Specifically, the CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from the state-wide database (CINC), regional CDS site self-assessments, and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The findings of noncompliance were verified as corrected when all 8 of the regional CDS sites with incidents of noncompliance had achieved 100% compliance with conducting transition conferences for one month.

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

The CDS State IEU verified that the 60 individual cases of noncompliance across 8 regional sites which occurred in FFY 2016 had been corrected and that a transition conference had been conducted for all affected toddlers, although less than 90 days from their third birthday. Individual child records were reviewed to verify that, although late, a transition conference occurred for all 60 children.

## 8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8C - OSEP Response

In its description of correction of noncompliance, the State referenced an incorrect regulatory requirement. The State wrote, "...the regulatory requirements specific to the timely provision of services." However, Indicator 8C measures the percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services. Therefore, the State did not demonstrate that the EIS program or provider corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 and FFY 2018 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 EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 and FFY 2018 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.

## 8C - Required Actions

# Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Select yes to use target ranges.**

Target Range not used

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

NO

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 0 |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The CDS State IEU utilizes the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) including revisions and setting targets. In addition, the SICC also discusses Part C trends and identifies priorities for Maine’s Part C program. The SICC is scheduled to meet on a quarterly basis.

CDS also works closely with regional site leadership and staff, contracted providers, and other State entities such as the Maine Education Center for Deaf/Hard of Hearing, the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research, Maine Families Home Visiting, Maine Center for Disease Control’s Children with Special Healthcare Needs, Child Welfare, and Early Head Start. These collaborations allow for the pooling of resources and increase stakeholder engagement with Part C. As a result, those stakeholders impact, both directly and indirectly, Maine’s performance on federal indicators.

Additionally, CDS continues to be involved in a number of initiatives in Maine where information is gathered from and shared in relation to Early Intervention Services and the success and challenges the State faces for infants/toddlers and their families. Like the SICC, these initiatives have cross sector representation. Some of these initiatives include the Early Intervention Working Group, the Early Childhood Consultation Program, and the Substance Exposed Infants and Maternal Substance Use Steering Committee.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target>= | 6.00% | 6.00% | 6.00% | 6.00% | 0.00% |
| Data |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target>= | 6.00% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 |  | 6.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

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

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2019. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

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

NO

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1 Mediations held | 3 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 0 |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The CDS State IEU utilizes the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) to solicit broad stakeholder input on the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) including revisions and setting targets. In addition, the SICC also discusses Part C trends and identifies priorities for Maine’s Part C program. The SICC is scheduled to meet on a quarterly basis.

CDS also works closely with regional site leadership and staff, contracted providers, and other State entities such as the Maine Education Center for Deaf/Hard of Hearing, the Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research, Maine Families Home Visiting, Maine Center for Disease Control’s Children with Special Healthcare Needs, Child Welfare, and Early Head Start. These collaborations allow for the pooling of resources and increase stakeholder engagement with Part C. As a result, those stakeholders impact, both directly and indirectly, Maine’s performance on federal indicators.

Additionally, CDS continues to be involved in a number of initiatives in Maine where information is gathered from and shared in relation to Early Intervention Services and the success and challenges the State faces for infants/toddlers and their families. Like the SICC, these initiatives have cross sector representation. Some of these initiatives include the Early Intervention Working Group, the Early Childhood Consultation Program, and the Substance Exposed Infants and Maternal Substance Use Steering Committee.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target>= | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 86.00% |
| Data |  |  |  | 100.00% |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target>= | 85.00% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 3 |  | 85.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

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

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2019. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## 10 - Required Actions

# Certification

**Instructions**

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

**Certify**

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

**Select the certifier’s role**

Designated Lead Agency Director

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

**Name:**

Jamie Michaud

**Title:**

Part C State Coordinator

**Email:**

Jamie.L.Michaud@maine.gov

**Phone:**

2072998290

**Submitted on:**