**Maine State Advisory Panel**

August 18, 2021 10AM-12PM

Department of Education

Zoom Meeting

Minutes

**Present:**

Erin Frazier, MDOE Special Services Director

Tracy Whitlock, MDOE Special Projects Coordinator

Holly Day, Special Education Director

Colette Sullivan, MDOE Federal Programs Manager

Jodi Hall, Parent

Benjamin Jones, DRM Staff Attorney

Libby-Stone Sterling, Chair, Vocational Rehab Representative

Shawn Collier, MDOE Data

Jim Roberts, Teacher

Carrie Woodcock, Parent, MPF Executive Director

Nancy Cronin, MDDC Executive Director

Alisha Brownstein, MDOE Minutes

**Agenda:**

* Department Updates
* Public Comment
* State Performance/Annual Performance Reports

**Erin Frazier- Department of Education Updates:**

* The end of July the department hosted three days of in person workgroup sessions for transition and extended eligibility. Day 1 was for policy group which includes state policy makers that all agencies support people with disabilities throughout life. Days 2 and 3 were for all policy makers and stakeholders. Stakeholders included state department representatives, SAU administrators, special educators, representatives from higher education, Special Purpose Private Schools (SPPS) and advocacy groups including the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).
* Discussion guide for students, families and IEP teams to be completed by October MADSEC conference, going to roll out training/support.
* Awarded SPDG (State Personnel Development Grant) from US Department of Education (USDOE) Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)
* 3 LDs from CDS currently planning timeline. 136 works on the potential of statewide Medicaid billing system to increase billing on state.
* 255 separating Part C from 3-5-year old’s rebranding it. Getting nominations for people who want to participate in proposed plan.
* LD 386 4-6-year-old timeline plan on getting back into SAUs and what that would take, developing plan right now. Stakeholder group attached to it. Sending out emails to see who to nominate.
* Report to present to the legislation committee in February. Can take a member from SAP team if interested on working on what those workshops will look like.
* Updating LD 73 putting out guidance on that, so people are aware of changes.
* Law 986 asks commissioner to write study on services available after school ends working to understand how DHHS can be involved in that. Working in partnership with DHHS to make sure they are involved in 136 and 856 around school-based Maine care services.
* Researching other states and accessing Maine care billing.
* DOE going to supreme court at the end of the year, because of this MUSER will not happen next legislative season.
* Making changes in MUSER aging out to 22.
* Planned change ed tech can work based on certification broadening work to include being able to support community employment at any ed tech level.
* Right now, there are not enough ed techs and bus drivers.
* OSEP is coming in to audit the DOE starting next fall, there may be a delay.
* Rewriting dispute resolution.
* Age span in high school 5-year age span from k-12 changing for high school to have longer span.
* Dispute resolution coordinator position has been filled after over a year and a half of being vacant.
* Math4ME targeted rural areas of Maine for math instruction professional development, ed techs are included in the training with their supervising special educator.
* A question was asked “Is there any flexibility for the pay rate at an ed tech level 3?” “The pay is too low. There are emergency certifications for ed techs but there are not enough applicants. “

**Shawn Collier: State Performance/Annual Performance Report-**

* Document is submitted to OSEP every year.
* 17 indicators are reported on: Graduation, dropout rates, state assessments, etc.
* OSEP reauthorized entire package this year, now moving forward with package with modifications for the next 6 years. Some modifications with some indicators some have stayed the same. Targets are where we want to be on indicators. OSEP sets compliance indicator targets at 0-100%. Performance indicators state sets those targets. We need to decide what we want to strive for.
* Wanted to see 90% graduation rate through 2019. Baseline is wherever started from. Started with 66.02% use that to set target. We want to be above to improve. Improved gradual increase in graduation rate.
* Suggested to retain graduation rate target at 90% through 2025.
* New baseline means there was a fresh start to the indicator because measurements were changed somehow.
* Projections educate us to know if targets are robust. Understanding projections and how they are calculated.
* New dropout baseline is 17.99%
* Suggested value of target for dropout’s at or under 16.10% by 2025, likely to meet target. Suggested target trajectory as follows:   
  2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025  
  17.99% 17.99% 17.99% 16.99% 16.5% 16.10%
* Educational environment indicator first part number of kids with IEP inside 80% or more of the day, old baseline 56.41 new APR included 5 year old’s in Kindergarten new baseline is 56.11%, want to be above this, target 57% for 2025, not likely to meet this based on projection. Suggested target trajectory as follows:   
  2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025  
  56.11% 56.11% 56.33% 56.33% 56.66% 57%
* Educational environment indicator part 2 of indicator 5 school age with IEPs inside regular class less than 40% of the day want to see data decline more students in less restricted environment. Slight decrease overall. 10.78% is the new baseline. Target at end of 6 years must be below this baseline, likely to be around 10.6% by 2025 which is below new baseline making it acceptable.
* A 1% increase or decrease is about 320 students.
* Suggestion on writing to the commissioner to see what we can do to support this. Data is declining so we are slightly going in the right direction.
* Suggestion for target not as much expect to decline would be 10.6 by 2025 which doesn’t seem very robust in trying to improve. Folks may agree if we went closer to 10% the lower projection.
* A question was asked “Can we keep at 9?” “Yes, but in the APR whenever we don’t meet targets, we have to include explanations to OSEP what we are actively doing to meet these targets and why we think we did not meet. Also, what we are doing to meet the target.”
* Increasing may look like we are not trying to get target lower concerns.
* Targets can be reset.
* A question was asked “Is there a way to tease out numbers to show before PBIS numbers and after?” “Yes, we would need districts to provide LRE data for those years.”
* Target suggestion for 5B) Ed Environment Inside Regular Class Less than 40% was to stay at or under 9% through 2025.
* New baseline for 5C) Ed Environment Separate Schools, Residential, Homebound/Hospital is 3.46%.
* Target suggestion for 5C) Ed Environment Separate Schools, Residential, Homebound/Hospital … trajectory:   
  2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025  
  3.46% 3.46% 3.46% 3.34% 3.22% 3.1%
* Legal indicators: Indicator 15 and Indicator 16.
* Indicator 15, Resolution Agreements: Baseline goes back to 2005 the nature of measurement has not changed at all. 57% hearing requests were resolved with settlement agreement, in 2006 50%, in 2009 25% up and down because there are so few. 2010 20% reported to OSEP because there were 10 hearing requests but 2011 was not applicable as we did not have to report to OSEP what the percentage was because we were at 4% (under 10) actual data would have been 50% if reported.
* 2012 reported to OSEP with 11 36.36% resolved through resolution agreements. 2013-2019 not applicable, total hearing requests under 10. Other states have similar data. NH has fewer than 10 sessions, 7 last year. Set target at 58% or higher of agreements, NH set as range target 63-73%. Vermont also regularly has under 10 sessions per year, target set at or above 60% since 2013. At least more than 50% should be successful in resolution sessions.
* Do not see reasoning behind rate.
* Suggestion was to keep Indicator 15 target set at 58% through 2025.
* Indicator 16, Mediation agreements: Baseline goes back to 2005 because the measure has not changed.
* 83.3% mediations resulted in agreements; over the years it has gone down.
* Mediations have not changed drastically around 50 each year. 1 agreement would equal to 2% change in data.
* Projections for an idea as we come up with targets NH and VT to compare VT is at 82% since 2014, data has been right where ME is in the low 60s-70s. NH 65-75% range data generally in low 70% range.
* Our target has not been meeting, hoping to have 85% of agreements come out of mediations, have not met our target since 2008. Need to decide if we would like target to lower or stay the same.
* Suggestion on keeping at 85%. Concern on 85% being too high in polarized world we are in right now. A question was asked “Is this reason to decrease?” A friendly reminder that if we do not meet targets, we will need to explain to OSEP. Baseline is targets show improvement over baseline so technically they must stay around 85 but the trend has been declining the target no longer may make sense to some people based on that baseline. Would not be able to reduce target based on baseline.

**Public comment:** Working closely with the Maine DOE, MPF (Maine Parent Federation) to get parents, teachers and staff feedback to try and make it more parent friendly. Also, school staff will have the ability to give feedback.

Conference call line information: 877-455-0244

Code: 7557916562

Next meeting: September 15, 2021