

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY 2024**

Maine



PART B DUE February 2, 2026

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The Maine Department of Education (Maine DOE) Office of Special Services and Inclusive Education (OSSIE) and Child Development Services (CDS) implement the birth to twenty (B-20) General Supervision System to manage and oversee all aspects of effective implementation and integrated monitoring activities pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Maine has extended its General Supervision to include education through the 22nd birthday as rulemaking is established regarding the administrative letter found here: <https://mainedoe.news.net/2021/01/21/administrative-letter-change-in-the-ending-age-for-special-education-eligibility-effective-immediately/>.

Evaluations and interventions of Local Education Agencies (LEAs) focus on improving infant, toddler and school-age student outcomes. The process is designed to enhance partnerships among the Maine DOE OSSIE, CDS, LEAs, other educational and community agencies, service providers, and parents in implementing Part C and Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). These partnerships focus on early intervention and special education services and systems that directly impact results for children and the development and implementation of improvement strategies to address identified needs.

Maine DOE monitoring activities are dedicated to improving educational results and purposeful outcomes for all children with disabilities. The Department continues to ensure districts and regional CDS sites provide programs and services for children with disabilities as described and required under federal law Section 616 of the 2004 Amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Multiple data sources and methods are used to monitor every LEA in the state. Integrated on-site and off-site monitoring activities ensure Maine's capacity to identify and correct noncompliance and facilitate improved performance. Additionally, Maine DOE provides technical assistance, professional development, and a variety of resources with the purpose of developing supports that are accessible to LEAs and stakeholders around the state. The Introduction sections below address Maine's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance, Professional Development, Stakeholder Involvement, and Public Reporting.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

In addition to data collected from each LEA through a statewide data system, APR data are also collected through monitoring activities. Based on data from both sources, all LEAs receive and review, on a yearly basis, a letter with their determination status and the LEA profile. The profiles provide indicator-specific data to the LEA and to the public for use in program improvement. The indicators are evaluated for level of determination to provide the LEA with measurement-specific feedback on their implementation of IDEA. Maine DOE's data manager works collaboratively with the federal programs coordinator for the collection of State and LEA data and performance measures, corrections of noncompliance and activities supporting LEAs improving results for children with disabilities. Outcomes of the SPP inform monitoring activities (e.g., child find, transition from early intervention and postsecondary transition planning).

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

267

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions). Include a description of all the mechanisms the State uses to identify and verify correction of noncompliance and improve results. This should include, but not be limited to, State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which the State is able to determine compliance and/or issue written findings of noncompliance. The State should include the following elements:

Describe the process the State uses to select LEAs for monitoring, the schedule, and number of LEAs monitored per year.

LEAs are monitored on a 4-year rotation. Beginning in 2022-2023, the Monitoring Team began implementing a Results-Based Accountability System that places each LEA in one of four tiers based on a variety of factors. Placement in a particular tier involves varying levels of professional development requirements as well as SEA provided technical assistance. LEAs in Tier I are monitored again in six years, Tiers II and III are kept on the 4-year cycle, and LEAs in Tier IV are provided intensive support for one year then placed back in the monitoring cohort the following year, effectively a 2-year cycle.

Describe how student files are chosen, including the number of student files that are selected, as part of the State's process for determining an LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements and verifying the LEA's correction of any identified noncompliance.

Each LEA in the current monitoring cohort completes a self-assessment of 20 files. LEAs are instructed to include files across schools, case managers, disability identification, ages, etc. They must also include out-of-unit files – at least one from each out-of-unit partner. These same files are reviewed by the Monitoring Team during an on-site visit. When the Corrective Action Plan is issued, the LEA is given a document detailing child-specific findings of non-compliance. This document is used by the Monitoring Team to ensure that each instance of non-compliance is corrected within one year.

Describe the data system(s) the State uses to collect monitoring and SPP/APR data, and the period from which records are reviewed.

Data collected originated from the 2024-25 school year unless the indicator was lag-year indicator, in which data examined were from 2023-24. Prefilled APR data originated from Maine 618 data submissions via the EDPass or EMAPS data systems. For monitoring data, the Maine DOE monitoring team visits each LEA in the current monitoring cohort to review files. Maine does not have a statewide data system for IEPs and each LEA contracts with a vendor and/or maintains paper files. The team uses an Excel spreadsheet to track data on 67 specific indicators and issues a finding of non-compliance for each state indicator that is less than 100% compliant.

Describe how the State issues findings: by number of instances or by LEAs.

Findings are issued by LEA, one finding for each indicator that is less than 100% compliant. The LEA is given a document detailing child-specific findings of non-compliance. This document is used by the Monitoring Team to ensure that each instance of non-compliance is corrected within one year. A particular finding is not considered closed until each instance is corrected and evidence of subsequent systemic correction is provided.

If applicable, describe the adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction).

After the on-site visit, the Monitoring Team provides the LEA with a list of findings that they can choose to correct as pre-findings. To qualify as a pre-findings, the specific indicator must be at least 80% compliant and there must be evidence of subsequent systemic correction. The LEA has 30 days to correct these findings if they choose to do so.

Describe the State's system of graduated and progressive sanctions to ensure the correction of identified noncompliance and to address areas in need of improvement, used as necessary and consistent with IDEA Part B's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

The implementation of Maine's Results-Based Accountability System has allowed the Monitoring Team to provide intensive technical assistance and support where it is needed and has resulted in near 100% correction of non-compliance within one year. In the rare instance that an LEA does not correct a finding of non-compliance, the Maine Monitoring Team meets with the special education director to discuss the root cause of the non-compliance and provide support to remedy that root cause. If the LEA continues to fail to correct non-compliance, SEA Director writes a letter noting next steps to potentially include withholding of funds. To date, Maine has not had LEAs go beyond this step. Graduated and progressive assistance and potential sanctions additionally include the following:

Needs Assistance:

- May require site visit
- May require partial verification audit
- May require focused self-assessment in areas of deficiency
- May require determination response plan
- Advise of available resources and technical assistance
- Requires maintaining Maintenance of Effort (MOE)

Needs Intervention:

- May require completion of a focused self-assessment
- May require partial verification audit
- Requires use of identified resources and technical assistance
- Requires proof of utilization of technical assistance on identified outcomes
- Identifies SAU as high-risk grantee
- May require determination response plan
- May impose conditions on use of funds
- Requires maintaining MOE

Needs Substantial Intervention:

- Requires updated self-assessment
- Requires full verification audit (Review: Parent Input, Desk Audit Information, Monitoring Information, and Full Profile Review)
- Requires use of identified resources and technical assistance
- Requires proof of utilization of technical assistance on identified outcomes
- Identifies SAU as high-risk grantee
- Imposes conditions on use of funds
- Requires determination response plan facilitated by MDOE regarding selected indicators
- Determination of partial or whole withholding of funds
- Requires maintaining MOE

Describe how the State makes annual determinations of LEA performance, including the criteria the State uses and the schedule for notifying LEAs of their determinations. If the determinations are made public, include a web link for the most recent determinations.

Annual determinations are made for each of the compliance indicators contained in the SPP/APR. In addition to data collected from each LEA through a statewide data system, APR data are also collected through monitoring activities. Based on data from both sources, all LEAs receive and review, on a yearly basis, a letter with their determination status and the LEA profile. Determinations are issued within 120 days of the publication of the SPP/APR for a given year. The profiles provide indicator-specific data to the LEA and to the public for use in program improvement. The LEA profiles are used as the basis for determinations of LEA program performance. The indicators are evaluated for level of determination to provide the LEA with measurement-specific feedback on their implementation of IDEA.

The following compliance indicators and regulatory compliance factors are considered for making district determinations:

Indicator 4b: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in suspensions or expulsions greater than 10 days during the school year and policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Target = 0%.

Substantial Compliance: No racial/ethnic disproportionality or policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the discrepancy.

Did not meet target: One or more areas of disproportionality and policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the discrepancy.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. Target = 0%.

Substantial Compliance: No disproportionality as a result of inappropriate identification.

Did not meet target: One or more areas of disproportionality as a result of inappropriate identification.

Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Target = 0%

Substantial Compliance: No disproportionality as a result of inappropriate identification.

Did not meet target: One or more areas of disproportionality as a result of inappropriate identification.

Indicator 11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the state establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe (For Maine, 45 school days for school aged children, 60 calendar days for children aged 3-5).

Target = 100%.

Substantial Compliance: 95%–100% of children were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or within state established timeframe. Note: state law requires evaluations of students age six and older to be completed within 45 school days; children age three through age five must have their evaluations completed within 60 calendar days.

Did not meet target: < 95% of children were evaluated within state established timeframe after receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.

Indicator 13: Percent of youth with IEPs in 9th grade and above or age 16 and above who have an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed

and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

Target = 100%.

Substantial Compliance: 95%–100% of youth in 9th grade and above or age 16 and above have an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals.

Did not meet target: < 95% of youth in 9th grade and above or age 16 and above have an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals.

Correction of Previous Noncompliance: Previous noncompliance regarding Indicator 4b, 9, 10, 11, or 13 is corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Target = 100%.

Substantial Compliance: 100% of noncompliance corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Did not meet target: One or more citations of noncompliance not corrected within one year.

Timely and Accurate Data (LE and 618): District data are submitted in a timely and accurate manner, according to state guidelines.

Substantial Compliance: Data requested by the Department were provided on time and validated accurate and complete. District percentages of 95%–100% indicate Substantial Compliance. Extent of lateness and data quality issues are indicated by percentages below 100%.

Did not meet target: One or more data submissions were provided beyond established deadline and/or determined inaccurate, incomplete or invalid. Extent of lateness and data quality issues are indicated by percentages below 100%. District percentages < 95% indicate noncompliance.

Fiscal Audit: Fiscal audit noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Substantial Compliance: 100% of noncompliance corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Did not meet target: One or more citations of noncompliance not corrected within one year.

Regulatory Adherence/Isolated Deficiencies: Noncompliance regarding Chapter 101 (Maine Unified Special Education Regulation Birth to Age Twenty) and applicable federal IDEA regulations is corrected within one year from identification or as required by agreement with Maine Department of Education.

Substantial Compliance: 100% of noncompliance corrected within one year or as required by agreement with Maine Department of Education.

Did not meet target: One or more citations of noncompliance not corrected within one year or as required by agreement with Maine Department of Education.

Not Applicable: Noncompliance was not identified during the reporting period.

Maine DOE's data manager works collaboratively with the federal programs coordinator for the collection of State and LEA data and performance measures, corrections of noncompliance, and activities supporting LEAs improving results for children with disabilities. Outcomes of the LEA Determinations and SPP/APR data inform monitoring activities (e.g., child find, transition from early intervention and postsecondary transition planning).

Provide the web link to information about the State's general supervision policies, procedures, and process that is made available to the public.

<https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialized/supervision>

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based technical assistance, and support to LEAs.

Maine Department of Education Office of Special Services and Inclusive Education (OSSIE) and Child Development Services (CDS) provide a range of technical assistance. Technical assistance is implemented at varying levels and through multiple means such as websites, local, regional and/or state-wide meetings and conferences, virtual or direct training from state personnel and from other resources. Maine DOE and CDS have several mechanisms

in place to ensure high quality, evidence-based practices and support to LEAs occurs in a timely manner. Structures that exist within the Office of Special Services and CDS connect technical assistance and professional development initiatives across the Department of Education and through National TA Centers to provide collaborative technical assistance. The department is informed of needs directly by districts, regional CDS sites, contracted providers, community members, families or the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC). Technical assistance is then designed to meet the needs of the LEA and can take any variety of forms, including on-line resources, documents, coaching, mentoring, and training of trainers or leader teams. In addition, Maine DOE regularly communicates with LEA's regarding current issues and offers guidance in a publication called the Maine DOE Update. Additionally, in Directors Meetings, the OSSIE Director and staff meet virtually with LEA Special Education Directors and staff bimonthly to provide timely updates and informational sessions and address special topics of interest and importance.

The Monitoring Team continued to implement individualized Technical Assistance to LEAs whose self-assessment and audit indicated this level of support. Through the implementation of Results Based Accountability Systems, those in the cohort are placed in tiered levels, with specific supports designed to address each placement. The rubric outlines specific training components as well and can be found here: <https://www.maine.gov/doe/sites/maine.gov.doe/files/inline-files/Supervision and Monitoring - 2025-26 Tiered Support Rubric - 6.5.2025.pdf>. To address concerns for those in Tier IV, the team schedules quarterly onsite visits to review files and close findings on Corrective Action Plans. The LEAs work closely with the Supervision and Monitoring team prior to onsite visits and develop individualized documents to organize the visits.

Dispute Resolution staff are also available to provide technical assistance and offer explanations regarding federal and state laws related to special education, describe the options that are available to parents/guardians, inform parents/guardians about procedural safeguards, identify other agencies and support services, and describe available remedies and how to proceed. Additionally, constituent communication is analyzed to assess trends across the state to fine tune technical assistance. In response to increased demand from the field for facilitated IEP meetings as a form of technical assistance, the Dispute Resolution staff added three additional IEP facilitators to the roster. Like the others in the rotation, the new facilitators received training from Key2Ed/CASE before they were appointed to cases.

The State Agency Programs (SAP) Team provides consistent TA and PD Office hours as well as periodic specific PD on State Agency Clients, Surrogate Parents, Least Restrictive Environment, etc. based on need and inquiry; to a variety of constituents. Technical assistance and PD helps stakeholders understand the surrogate parent's and education team's responsibilities and roles, as well as invoicing TA and training for both LEAs and Special Purpose Private Schools (SPPS); sometimes statewide to State Directors, sometimes regional (DHHS or Department of Corrections staff), and sometimes site specific (LEA or SPPS).

The Maine fiscal team attended several virtual and in-person conferences during the past year. These included a writing workshop with NCSI, IDC, and CIFR in March, a 2-day training on audits in September, and hosted a UGG/EDGAR training with Brustein Manasevit in October. Virtual training included a WestEd Virtual 4-part Conference: EDGAR, UGG, How to Effectively Develop a Budget, Internal Controls and the Green Book. Additionally, the fiscal team attended several Community of Practice sessions throughout the year, including open door Cashing In on Compliance: IDEA Funding Dos and Don'ts, as well as Problems of Practice CoP and Fiscal Timeline CoP monthly meetings. The writing workshop in DC allowed the Maine team to conduct a comprehensive review of their written Parentally Placed Private School Proportionate Share of IDEA Funds policies and procedures. The audit training updated GASB changes and strengthened the team's auditing skills. The UGG/EDGAR training provided a comprehensive review and update for Maine federal fiscal teams. The fiscal team attended the annual Tri State ASBO 2-day conference with state business managers (State Hot Topics, GASB, Negotiations, AI, Budget Modeling), and the fall MADSEC conference and Directors Academy with state Special Education Directors. The team provided TA learning sessions at a 2-day Educator's Summit/Business Manager Bootcamp, semi-annual state ASBO meetings, on site fiscal monitoring site visits, and monthly open office hours offered in partnership with all state federal teams. TA topics included Grant Types – Formula vs. Competitive, Budgeting, Required Policies and Procedures, Administration & Reporting, Obligation and Period of Performance, Timely Drawdown of Funds, Liquidation of Funds, Time & Effort, Record Retention, Equipment Inventory, MaineCare, Internal Controls, Coding and Chart of Accounts, Documentation & Record Keeping, Resources, Grants4ME Application and Year End Reporting, Invoice Training, Contracts/ Contract Development, and Summer Accruals.

The State Agency Programs (SAP) team utilized the National Technical Assistance Center for Transition (NTACT) and provided Special Purpose Private Schools (SPPS) special education programming training and technical assistance. In addition, the SAP Team participated in the Center for Community Inclusion and Disabilities Studies (CCIDS) collaborative focusing on Family Centered Transition Planning, also for PD and TA with Maine public and private schools. The SAP Team also utilized the NCSI-National Center for Systemic Improvement, participated in the monthly RBAS Results-Based Accountability Practice Group and incorporated in training and technical assistance with LEAs and SPPS. In addition, the SAP Team often participated in the non-traditional placements meetings in the SEA Leadership collaborative to support each other and inform policy and practice needs.

State Monitoring Team: Members of the Supervision, Monitoring, and Support team the following conferences in 2024-2025: NASDE, DMS Cohort 2 Convening, IDC ii25, NCSI Policy Writing Workshop. We also met with our technical assistance providers from NCSI and IDC several times to review monitoring procedures and practices as we worked to bring them in line with state and federal regulations as well as OSEP Q&A 23-01. As a result of these meetings and information from the conferences listed above, the team updated our Supervision, Monitoring, and Support Manual, citing OSEP 23-01 throughout. The team also updated our electronic monitoring tool and ensured that all monitoring and professional development materials are correctly cited to IDEA and/or MUSER. Team members participated in monthly meetings for the NCSI Results Based Accountability Systems, Evidence Based Practices Collaboratives, Data Quality Peer Groups around Federal Indicators 4, 9, 10 and 18, the Data Center for Addressing Significant Disproportionality (DCASD). The team worked to bring this knowledge into the process of reviewing and revising monitoring and professional development practices.

Professional Development System:

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

Professional development, as part of an effective system of general supervision, is directly linked to the SPP/APR and a number of initiatives and improvement activities. Maine DOE and Child Development Services State IEU (CDSSIEU) provides a variety of opportunities to impact performance, from statewide activities to regional trainings, all with a purpose of developing supports that are accessible to LEAs around the state. Maine DOE OSSIE and CDSSIEU contracts and enters into working relationships with technical assistance, professional development, and dissemination of resources regionally and nationally to provide evidence-based practice professional development to educators and educator leaders, parents, and interested parties. Maine DOE and CDS have several mechanisms in place to ensure high quality, evidence-based practices and support to LEAs occurs in a timely manner. Structures that exist within the Office of Special Services and CDS connect to professional development initiatives across the Department of Education and include the following:

New Directors Academy: In collaboration with the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) Maine DOE presents a multi-day training for special education directors and CDS regional directors in the field for two years or less. Trainings typically follow an alternating year schedule. By working with MADSEC the department is able to respond to the training needs of the State. To maintain support to the field, the Monitoring, and Support team continued to offer regularly scheduled Office Hours. During each session, the team consistently embedded and referenced the following information:

- Corresponding PowerPoint
- Procedural Manual
- Maine Unified Special Education Regulations (MUSER)

- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

The second Wednesday of each month was dedicated to specific topics. Office Hours for the 2024-2025 school year included the following:

- Resources
- IEP Essentials for New Teachers
- IEP Alignment
- Advanced Written Notice and Written Notice
- Inclusion
- How Community Case Managers Can Help the IEP Team
- Alternate Assessments
- Compliant Versus Good IEPs – Developing a Strong IEP
- Accommodations and Services
- Transition from CDS to Public School
- Abbreviated Day
- Special Education Law for General Education Teachers
- Discipline and Manifestation Determination
- Special Education Forms

The topic-specific sessions lasted up to 60 minutes and all participants were offered a certificate of attendance. Office hours were recorded and the link to these archived trainings and corresponding PowerPoints can be found at: Special Services Professional Learning | Department of Education

Other cohort-specific Professional Development trainings included the following:

- Cohort Specific Training
- CAP Specific Training
- CAP Workshops
- How to Choose IEPs for Your Self-Assessment

More specific trainings were also provided as various questions and/or concerns were raised, and feedback was requested by the LEAs. These were highly individualized and intended to meet the needs of the LEAs who requested them. The team was also invited to present at a meeting of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities' (MADSEC) central region.

Collaboration with other specialist teams within Maine DOE continues to be a priority. The Supervision, Monitoring and Support team continues to collaborate closely with the Due Process Team, the Assessment Team and the Multilingual Learners Team. When making determinations about tiered levels for those in cohort, the Supervision, Monitoring and Support team meets with the corresponding teams and considers all relevant information. Maine additionally provided monthly professional development sessions Special Purpose Private School staff and hosted special events open to all Maine students, parents, and schools. Specific professional development was provided regarding State Agency Clients and Surrogate Parents in addition to other topics of interest and need. The professional development was provided to a variety of constituents, including the Department of Health and Human Services and Community Case Managers who work to coordinate care for State Agency Clients. Professional development was offered in statewide forums, regionally, and to specific LEAs or Special Purpose Private Schools.

Additional ongoing professional development initiatives that continued through FFY2024 include the following:

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

PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports): PBIS programming promotes school-wide systemic behavior change in elementary, middle, and high schools.

Dyslexia: In partnership with EarlyBird Education, this initiative provides access to a gamified literacy/dyslexia screener application LEAs and is accompanied with data and literacy focused professional development.

Maine Autism Institute for Education and Research (MAIER): MAIER is a collaborative with the department and the University of Maine to build statewide support for autistic students through training, professional development, technical assistance, collaborative consultation, technology, and research.

Maine also continues to access support from the National Technical Assistance Center for Transition (NTACT) to improve indicator B-13 compliance. NTACT has also assisted in the dissemination of professional development addressing standards aligned IEP development.

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public.

This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative

of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.

Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.

Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the authorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.

Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

Maine continues to increase capacity for the participation of diverse groups of parents by developing advanced functionality of surveys, including the ability to participate in surveys by phone using a QR code and developing surveys and stakeholder input documents that are accessible to non-English speakers. Additionally, Maine continues to work with the Maine Parent Federation to reach underrepresented populations of parents and will include targeted sessions for underrepresented groups to ensure a diversity of represented stakeholders.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

32

Parent Members Engagement:

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

Parent participation on the State Advisory Panel and other advisory committees is strong in Maine. The State Advisory Panel (SAP) has strong representation of community stakeholders, including 6 members who are either parents or individuals with disabilities. One fourth of members on the State Dyslexia Stakeholder Group are either parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability; the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Stakeholder Group has 3 parents or individuals with a disability among its 20 members; and the Math4ME (SSIP) Stakeholder group has 12 members including 2 who are either parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. The state also invites parent participation through more informal meetings and communication with the Maine Parent Federation.

These stakeholder groups and the SAP play a direct role in analyzing data, setting targets, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress in activities reported in this SPP/APR. Additionally, to expand parent engagement in development of the new SPP/APR targets and long term strategies to improve student outcomes, the MPF worked directly with Maine DOE staff in creating a series of recorded videos designed to present APR indicator content, historical data, analysis of trends/forecasts, and implementation strategies to parents and the public. The videos were produced by MPF staff, are presented in non-technical language, and include links to surveys for stakeholder and parent input and suggested target-setting. Maine DOE and MPF publications/announcements on official websites, social media, and announcements at live conference sessions helped to ensure wide dissemination of opportunities for participation. The MPF also conducted multiple live sessions that included the presentation of APR indicator content, historical data, analysis of trends/forecasts, and implementation strategies to parents and the public. These sessions were advertised by DOE and MPF via social media, email, list serves and the Maine DOE website.

Additionally, the Maine DOE Dispute Resolution Team also continues to use established systems to engages parent members to provide opportunities for feedback on the dispute resolution process. Parent members present in the mediations and dispute resolution activities are provided with feedback forms for input on mediations and due process activities. This information is then reviewed by the team and is shared with the mediators and hearing officers. It continues to provide valuable data to improve dispute resolution practice.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

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

Maine continues to increase capacity for the participation of diverse groups of parents by developing advanced functionality of surveys, including the ability to participate in surveys by phone using a QR code and developing surveys and stakeholder input documents that are accessible to non-English speakers. Additionally, Maine continues to work with the Maine Parent Federation to reach underrepresented populations of parents and will include targeted sessions for underrepresented groups to ensure a diversity of represented stakeholders.

Increasing meaningful participation from diverse stakeholders has been a focus of the office and continues to be refined and developed. In addition to the surveying and accessible documents, Maine has developed a Special Education Glossary, interpreted in 9 languages, for families to support their communication with districts and their advocacy for their children. This document includes translations of terminology associated with special education. The Maine DOE has a Family Engagement position that was recently added to the Department and supports expansion of participation of families in their child's educational programs. During the FFY 22 calendar year, a survey of partners in Maine Unified Special Education Regulations (MUSER) revealed a need for a more parent friendly documents in more languages to increase parent and community understanding of special education. The

Department continues to analyze data to support increased understanding of special education policies and procedures to maximize stakeholder involvement in special education. Additionally, DOE personnel spent time supporting a clear understanding of the state's SPP/APR so they could meaningfully participate in setting targets for indicators.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

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

Making Results Available to the Public:

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

The results of the data analysis, evaluation, target setting, and improvement strategies are made available through several sources, including publication of the SPP/APR, public DOE Newsroom notices, and monthly public SAP meetings. Additionally, Maine DOE continues to collaborate with the Maine Parent Federation to provide informational sessions to parents/guardians and the public.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2023 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2023 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2023 APR in 2025, is available.

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

A complete copy of Maine's FFY2023 APR, and performance of LEAs on the SPP/APR targets are posted on the following webpage:

<https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed/ideapublic>.

Additionally, student assessment data are available on the following webpage:

<https://www.maine.gov/doe/dashboard>.

An additional supplementary assessment file can be found at <https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed/ideapublic>, which contains data for indicator 3A, 3B, and 3C. The file contains participation and performance data on statewide assessments for students with disabilities and supplements the data reported in the assessment reporting dashboard found at <https://www.maine.gov/doe/dashboard>.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2024 and 2025 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2025 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 2024 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2026, 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 2023 SPP/APR

Maine has reported on the technical assistance sources from which we have received assistance and the actions taken as a result of that technical assistance. These provisions are found in the Technical Assistance and Professional Development sections of the Introduction.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2024 and 2025 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 20, 2025 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2024 SPP/APR submission, due February 2, 2026, 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: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED² file specification FS009.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, use data from 2023-2024), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	83.40%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target >=	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%
Data	72.94%	84.39%	83.40%	79.62%	80.76%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target >=	90.00%	90.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public.

This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.

Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.

Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the authorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.

Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.

Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

Maine continues to increase capacity for the participation of diverse groups of parents by developing advanced functionality of surveys, including the ability to participate in surveys by phone using a QR code and developing surveys and stakeholder input documents that are accessible to non-English speakers. Additionally, Maine continues to work with the Maine Parent Federation to reach underrepresented populations of parents and will include targeted sessions for underrepresented groups to ensure a diversity of represented stakeholders.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,733
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	19
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	390

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
1,733	2,142	80.76%	90.00%	80.91%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

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

The standards for obtaining a high school diploma are outlined in Maine statute 20-A Section 4722, which can be found here: <https://legislature.maine.gov/legis/statutes/20-A/title20-Asec4722.html>. These standards include required numbers of courses in English, Social Studies, Mathematics, Science, and Fine Arts, and the availability of multiple pathways for demonstrating achievement of standards in these academic areas. Standards do not differ for students with IEPs; all students must meet the same requirements to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED²Facts file specification FS009.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, use data from 2023-2024), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	14.32%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target <=	19.00%	14.32%	14.32%	14.32%	14.32%
Data	17.91%	14.32%	16.45%	20.28%	18.31%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target <=	14.32%	13.32%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public.

This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided an opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.

Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.

Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the authorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.

Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

Maine continues to increase capacity for the participation of diverse groups of parents by developing advanced functionality of surveys, including the ability to participate in surveys by phone using a QR code and developing surveys and stakeholder input documents that are accessible to non-English speakers. Additionally, Maine continues to work with the Maine Parent Federation to reach underrepresented populations of parents and will include targeted sessions for underrepresented groups to ensure a diversity of represented stakeholders.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,733
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	19
SY 2023-24 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data group 85)	03/05/2025	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	390

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
390	2,142	18.31%	14.32%	18.21%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

Maine uses the same calculation as that used in 618 IDEA reporting: [(The number of youth with IEPs ages 14 through 21 who exited special education due to dropping out / The number of youth with IEPs ages 14 through 21 who left high school for the reasons listed below) * 100]. Students are counted as dropping out when identified with one of the following exit reasons: dropped out, status unknown, and moved, not known to be continuing. The reasons for which students with IEPs may have left school are: graduating with a regular high school diploma, reaching maximum age, and dropping out.

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

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	98.00%	98.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	98.00%	98.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	98.00%	98.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	98.00%	98.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	98.00%	98.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	98.00%	98.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public.

This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include a teacher; a representative of an

institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.

Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.

Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the authorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.

Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

Maine continues to increase capacity for the participation of diverse groups of parents by developing advanced functionality of surveys, including the ability to participate in surveys by phone using a QR code and developing surveys and stakeholder input documents that are accessible to non-English speakers. Additionally, Maine continues to work with the Maine Parent Federation to reach underrepresented populations of parents and will include targeted sessions for underrepresented groups to ensure a diversity of represented stakeholders.

FFY 2024 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Assessment Participation in Reading/Language Arts (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 882, 883)

Date:

01/07/2026

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)			
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)			
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards			

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Assessment Participation in Mathematics (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 880, 881)

Date:

01/07/2026

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)			
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)			
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards			

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row A for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot

assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			97.27%	98.00%	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8			92.90%	98.00%	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS			85.08%	98.00%	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			97.74%	98.00%	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8			92.86%	98.00%	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS			84.53%	98.00%	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

Student assessment data are available at <https://www.maine.gov/doe/dashboard>.

An additional supplementary assessment file can be found at <https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialized/ideapublic>. The file contains participation and performance data on statewide assessments for students with disabilities and supplements the data reported in the assessment reporting dashboard found at <https://www.maine.gov/doe/dashboard>.

An additional supplementary assessment file pertaining to children with disabilities participating in regular assessments with accommodations can be found at <https://www.maine.gov/doe/sites/maine.gov.doefiles/inline-files/IDEAAssessmentSupplement.xlsx>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY2024 data for Indicator 3A were not populated above due to a system error. Data for Indicator 3A can be found in the Indicator 3 attachment.

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

The State did not provide any data for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target. As noted in the 2025 IDEA Part B Determination letter, the 2024-25 IDEA Section 618 Part B data, including the assessment data (EDFacts files 175, 178, 185, 188), submitted as of the due date is being used for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR and the 2026 IDEA Part B Results Matrix. Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D are prefilled using the State-level assessment data submitted as of the due date for EDFacts assessment files. For the school year (SY) 2024-25 assessment data, the due date for these files was January 7, 2026. The State did not submit its SY 2024-25 assessment data by January 7, 2026. Data submitted through a correction opportunity (i.e., after the due date of January 7, 2026) are not prefilled into the State's SPP/APR, used in the IDEA Part B Results Matrix, or published in the IDEA Part B Assessment data file and associated products.

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED²Facts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2022	31.11%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2022	29.73%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2022	29.00%
Math	A	Grade 4	2022	25.21%
Math	B	Grade 8	2022	9.27%
Math	C	Grade HS	2022	18.15%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	35.11%	37.11%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	33.73%	3,573.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	33.00%	35.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	29.21%	31.21%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	13.27%	15.27%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	22.15%	24.15%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public.

This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of

Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.

Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.

Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the authorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.

Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

Maine continues to increase capacity for the participation of diverse groups of parents by developing advanced functionality of surveys, including the ability to participate in surveys by phone using a QR code and developing surveys and stakeholder input documents that are accessible to non-English speakers. Additionally, Maine continues to work with the Maine Parent Federation to reach underrepresented populations of parents and will include targeted sessions for underrepresented groups to ensure a diversity of represented stakeholders.

FFY 2024 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 876, 877)

Date:

01/07/2026

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment			
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Mathematics (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 874, 875)

Date:

01/07/2026

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment			
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with			

accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
--	--	--	--

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			32.30%	35.11%	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8			30.35%	33.73%	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS			29.49%	33.00%	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			23.32%	29.21%	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8			9.72%	13.27%	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS			10.62%	22.15%	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

Student assessment data are available at <https://www.maine.gov/doe/dashboard>.

An additional supplementary assessment file can be found at <https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed/ideapublic>. The file contains participation and performance data on statewide assessments for students with disabilities and supplements the data reported in the assessment reporting dashboard found at <https://www.maine.gov/doe/dashboard>.

An additional supplementary assessment file pertaining to children with disabilities participating in regular assessments with accommodations can be found at <https://www.maine.gov/doe/sites/maine.gov.doel/files/inline-files/IDEAAssessmentSupplement.xlsx>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY2024 data for Indicator 3B were not populated above due to a system error. Data for Indicator 3B can be found in the Indicator 3 attachment.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

The State did not provide any data for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target. As noted in the 2025 IDEA Part B Determination letter, the 2024-25 IDEA Section 618 Part B data, including the assessment data (EDFacts files 175, 178, 185, 188), submitted as of the due date is being used for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR and the 2026 IDEA Part B Results Matrix. Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D are prefilled using the State-level assessment data submitted as of the due date for EDFacts assessment files. For the school year (SY) 2024-25 assessment data, the due date for these files was January 7, 2026. The State did not submit its SY 2024-25 assessment data by January 7, 2026. Data submitted through a correction opportunity (i.e., after the due date of January 7, 2026) are not prefilled into the State's SPP/APR, used in the IDEA Part B Results Matrix, or published in the IDEA Part B Assessment data file and associated products.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	46.20%	48.20%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	55.13%	57.13%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	56.15%	58.15%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	48.91%	50.91%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	52.05%	54.05%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	53.00%	55.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public.

This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided an opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B)

that serves children with disabilities from age three through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.

Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.

Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the authorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.

Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

Maine continues to increase capacity for the participation of diverse groups of parents by developing advanced functionality of surveys, including the ability to participate in surveys by phone using a QR code and developing surveys and stakeholder input documents that are accessible to non-English speakers. Additionally, Maine continues to work with the Maine Parent Federation to reach underrepresented populations of parents and will include targeted sessions for underrepresented groups to ensure a diversity of represented stakeholders.

FFY 2024 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 876, 877)

Date:

01/07/2026

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

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

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Mathematics (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 874, 875)

Date:

01/07/2026

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

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

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			22.77%	46.20%	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8			29.89%	55.13%	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS			42.67%	56.15%	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			28.43%	48.91%	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8			40.70%	52.05%	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS			52.70%	53.00%	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

Student assessment data are available at <https://www.maine.gov/doe/dashboard>.

An additional supplementary assessment file can be found at <https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed/ideapublic>. The file contains participation and performance data on statewide assessments for students with disabilities and supplements the data reported in the assessment reporting dashboard found at <https://www.maine.gov/doe/dashboard>.

An additional supplementary assessment file pertaining to children with disabilities participating in regular assessments with accommodations can be found at <https://www.maine.gov/doe/sites/maine.gov.doefiles/inline-files/IDEAAssessmentSupplement.xlsx>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY2024 data for Indicator 3C were not populated above due to a system error. Data for Indicator 3C can be found in the Indicator 3 attachment.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

The State did not provide any data for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target. As noted in the 2025 IDEA Part B Determination letter, the 2024-25 IDEA Section 618 Part B data, including the assessment data (EDFacts files 175, 178, 185, 188), submitted as of the due date is being used for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR and the 2026 IDEA Part B Results Matrix. Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D are prefilled using the State-level assessment data submitted as of the due date for EDFacts assessment files. For the school year (SY) 2024-25 assessment data, the due date for these files was January 7, 2026. The State did not submit its SY 2024-25 assessment data by January 7, 2026. Data submitted through a correction opportunity (i.e., after the due date of January 7, 2026) are not prefilled into the State's SPP/APR, used in the IDEA Part B Results Matrix, or published in the IDEA Part B Assessment data file and associated products.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates For Children with IEPs and All Students Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2024-2025 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2024-2025 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2024-2025 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2024-2025 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2022	33.16
Reading	B	Grade 8	2022	36.44
Reading	C	Grade HS	2022	33.86
Math	A	Grade 4	2022	31.82
Math	B	Grade 8	2022	31.17
Math	C	Grade HS	2022	24.69

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	31.16	30.16
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	34.44	33.44
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	31.86	30.86
Math	A <=	Grade 4	29.82	28.82
Math	B <=	Grade 8	29.17	28.17
Math	C <=	Grade HS	22.69	21.69

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public.

This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.

Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.

Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the authorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.

Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

Maine continues to increase capacity for the participation of diverse groups of parents by developing advanced functionality of surveys, including the ability to participate in surveys by phone using a QR code and developing surveys and stakeholder input documents that are accessible to non-English speakers. Additionally, Maine continues to work with the Maine Parent Federation to reach underrepresented populations of parents and will include targeted sessions for underrepresented groups to ensure a diversity of represented stakeholders.

FFY 2024 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 876, 877)

Date:

01/07/2026

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment			
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment			
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Academic Achievement in Mathematics (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 874, 875)

Date:

01/07/2026

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
-------	---------	---------	----------

a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment			
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment			
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			32.20	31.16	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8			33.49	34.44	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS			31.57	31.86	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			31.21	29.82	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8			29.18	29.17	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS			32.01	22.69	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY2024 data for Indicator 3D were not populated above due to a system error. Data for Indicator 3D can be found in the Indicator 3 attachment.

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

The State did not provide any data for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target. As noted in the 2025 IDEA Part B Determination letter, the 2024-25 IDEA Section 618 Part B data, including the assessment data (EDFacts files 175, 178, 185, 188), submitted as of the due date is being used for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR and the 2026 IDEA Part B Results Matrix. Indicators 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D are prefilled using the State-level assessment data submitted as of the due date for EDFacts assessment files. For the school year (SY) 2024-25 assessment data, the due date for these files was January 7, 2026. The State did not submit its SY 2024-25 assessment data by January 7, 2026. Data submitted through a correction opportunity (i.e., after the due date of January 7, 2026) are not prefilled into the State's SPP/APR, used in the IDEA Part B Results Matrix, or published in the IDEA Part B Assessment data file and associated products.

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

The State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy. The State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. If so, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, use data from 2023-2024), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- Option 1: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- Option 2: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs.

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

If, under Option 1, the State uses a State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to compare to LEA-level long-term suspension and expulsion rates for the purpose of determining whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, the State must provide the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose long-term suspension/expulsion rate exceeds 2 percentage points above the State-level rate of 0.7%, the State must provide OSEP with the State-level rate of 0.7%).

If, under Option 2, the State uses a rate difference to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate difference used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs is 4 percentage points above the long-term suspension/expulsion rate for nondisabled children, the State must provide OSEP with the rate difference of 4 percentage points). Similarly, if, under Option 2, the State uses a rate ratio to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate ratio used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose ratio of its long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for children with IEPs to long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for nondisabled children is greater than 3.0, the State must provide OSEP with the rate ratio of 3.0).

Because the Measurement Table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2023-2024 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2023-2024 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2024-2025, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2023-2024 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2024 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2023-2024 (which can be found in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) 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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	1.52%	1.53%	1.01%	1.00%	1.01%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public.

This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided an opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.

Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.

Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the authorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.

Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

Maine continues to increase capacity for the participation of diverse groups of parents by developing advanced functionality of surveys, including the ability to participate in surveys by phone using a QR code and developing surveys and stakeholder input documents that are accessible to non-English speakers. Additionally, Maine continues to work with the Maine Parent Federation to reach underrepresented populations of parents and will include targeted sessions for underrepresented groups to ensure a diversity of represented stakeholders.

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If yes, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

The following decision rules are used to determine if there is a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for children with disabilities: The district must have a minimum of 10 students with IEPs enrolled. For districts meeting the n size threshold of 10, the number of students suspended or expelled over 10 days must be greater than 1 and the rate of suspension/expulsion over 10 days must be more than 3 standard deviations above the State's rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for students with disabilities.

If yes, the State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy.

The following decision rules are used to determine if there is a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for children with disabilities: The district must have a minimum of 10 students with IEPs enrolled. For districts meeting the n size threshold of 10, the number of students suspended or expelled over 10 days must be greater than 1 and the rate of suspension/expulsion over 10 days must be more than 3 standard deviations above the State's rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for students with disabilities. Maine's methodology for determining significant discrepancies has been designed with stakeholder input to ensure that the vast majority (around 75%) of LEAs meet the minimum requirements for inclusion in the analysis. The cell size threshold is particularly low; there must be greater than only 1 suspension/expulsion greater than 10 days for an LEA to be included in the analysis. However, the number of very small LEAs in Maine commonly results in only 1 or 0 suspensions/expulsions for greater than 10 days in a given LEA, resulting in approximately 25% of LEAs excluded from the analyses. Maine's threshold for identifying significant discrepancy (3 standard deviations above the overall state rate) is reasonably designed to identify highest rates of suspension/expulsion in the State based on only 1 year of data. This is a more stringent requirement than Maine's 618 Significant Disproportionality methodology, which is based on reasonable progress over the course of 3 consecutive years. Given the high percentage of Maine LEAs included in the analyses and threshold selection based on 1 year of discipline data, Maine believes that the methodology and thresholds have been reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days.

If yes, the State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

There has been no change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

If yes, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

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

68

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
2	199	1.01%	0.00%	1.01%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The following decision rules are used to determine if there is a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for children with disabilities: The district must have a minimum of 10 students with IEPs enrolled. For districts meeting the n size threshold of 10, the number of students suspended or expelled over 10 days must be greater than 1 and the rate of suspension/expulsion over 10 days must be more than 3 standard deviations above the State's rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for students with disabilities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2024 using 2023-2024 data)

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

Data from the 2023-2024 report of children with disabilities subject to disciplinary removal were examined to determine if significant discrepancies were occurring in the rates of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days. For districts identified with significant discrepancies, Maine DOE reviews specific files from each district with a compliance instrument to test compliance of each student file or policy document. The purpose of this review is to ensure that districts are properly developing and implementing IEPs, use positive behavioral interventions and supports, and include procedural safeguards as outlined in 34 C.F.R. 300.170 (b). This review also ensures compliance with regulations including removals that constitute a change in placement, manifestation determination review, and provision of services during disciplinary removal. Each instance of noncompliance is required to be corrected and the Maine DOE requires the district to revise their policies and procedures to comply with IDEA and Maine Unified Special Education Regulations as well as participate in training provided by the Maine DOE.

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

If YES, select one of the following:

The State DID NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

Corrective action for both LEAs is pending and due June 1st, 2026.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

When the Data Manager flags an LEA with potential noncompliance in this area, the Supervision, Monitoring and Support team is notified. Once notified, the team communicates with the LEA and reviews all related files against a template document that helps maintain consistency across team members. This document examines and makes note of the following items: Student Name, DOB, Disability Category, Teacher/Case Manager, School, Behavior of Concern, Date(s) of Removal, Length of Removal, Racial/Ethnic Group, Policies/Procedures/Practices, Documentation of Manifestation Determination, Documentation of FBA, and provision of services. This document identifies any trends or areas of concern or noncompliance. If noncompliance is identified, a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) is issued and is due as soon as possible, but no later than one year after the State's written notice of noncompliance, as outlined in OSEP memo 23-01. In FFY 2023, two LEAs were flagged by the Data Manager for potential noncompliance and the Supervision, Monitoring and Support team was notified. After following the process and reviewing both of these LEAs, both were identified as being noncompliant and findings of noncompliance were issued. Policies and procedures were reviewed, training for special education and general education administrators was provided by the Maine DOE, and both LEAs demonstrated 100% compliance and closed their CAP within one year after the written notification of noncompliance, per OSEP memo 23-01. Data subsequently collected through monitoring activities showed 100% compliance. The team also presents an annual, statewide training specific to disciplinary removals, which is recorded and posted on our professional learning web page for the entirety of the year. All PD is aligned with IDEA and the regulatory citations are included and referenced.

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

The team maintains an Excel document, called the Process Timeline, that outlines every step of the monitoring and supervision process. This process timeline has a tab where any findings for this indicator are documented, all notes, due dates and communication with each LEA are maintained. In FFY 2023, two LEAs were flagged by the Data Manager for potential noncompliance and the Supervision, Monitoring and Support team were notified. After following the process described above and reviewing both of these LEAs, both were identified as being noncompliant and findings of noncompliance were issued. Policies and procedures were reviewed, training for special education and general education administrators was provided by the Maine DOE. Due to lag-year data, all involved students had left jurisdiction - that is, they had graduated, aged out, or dropped out of school - before findings of noncompliance were issued.

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

The State must report, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2024 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, by race and ethnicity, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA, by race and ethnicity).

The State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity. The State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. If so, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, use data from 2023-2024), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- Option 1: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- Option 2: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs

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

If, under Option 1, the State uses a State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to compare to LEA-level long-term suspension and expulsion rates for the purpose of determining whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, the State must provide the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose long-term suspension/expulsion rate exceeds 2 percentage points above the State-level rate of 0.7%, the State must provide OSEP with the State-level rate of 0.7%).

If, under Option 2, the State uses a rate difference to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate difference used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, is 4 percentage points above the long-term suspension/expulsion rate for nondisabled children, the State must provide OSEP with the rate difference of 4 percentage points). Similarly, if, under Option 2, the State uses a rate ratio to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate ratio used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose ratio of its long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for nondisabled children is greater than 3.0, the State must provide OSEP with the rate ratio of 3.0).

Because the Measurement Table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2023-2024 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2023-2024 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2024-2025, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2023-2024 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2023-2024 (which can be found in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) 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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.52%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If yes, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities, by race and ethnicity, who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

The following decision rules are used to determine if there is a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for children with disabilities: The district must have a minimum of 10 students with IEPs enrolled. For districts meeting the n size threshold of 10, the number of students suspended or expelled over 10 days must be greater than 1 and the rate of suspension/expulsion over 10 days must be more than 3 standard deviations above the State's rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for students with disabilities.

If yes, the State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy.

The following decision rules are used to determine if there is a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for children with disabilities: The district must have a minimum of 10 students with IEPs enrolled. For districts meeting the n size threshold of 10, the number of students suspended or expelled over 10 days must be greater than 1 and the rate of suspension/expulsion over 10 days must be more than 3 standard deviations above the State's rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for students with disabilities. Maine's methodology for determining significant discrepancies has been designed with stakeholder input to ensure that the vast majority (around 75%) of LEAs meet the minimum requirements for inclusion in the analysis. The cell size threshold is particularly low; there must be greater than only 1 suspension/expulsion greater than 10 days for an LEA to be included in the analysis. However, the number of very small LEAs in Maine commonly results in only 1 or 0 suspensions/expulsions for greater than 10 days in a given LEA, resulting in approximately 25% of LEAs excluded from the analyses. Maine's threshold for identifying significant discrepancy (3 standard deviations above the overall state rate) is reasonably designed to identify highest rates of suspension/expulsion in the State based on only 1 year of data. This is a more stringent requirement than Maine's 618 Significant Disproportionality methodology, which is based on reasonable progress over the course of 3 consecutive years. Given the high percentage of Maine LEAs included in the analyses and threshold selection based on 1 year of discipline data, Maine believes that the methodology and thresholds have been reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days.

If yes, the State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

There has been no change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

If yes, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

There has been no change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

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

70

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
3	2	197	1.52%	0%	1.02%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The following decision rules are used to determine if there is a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days by race/ethnicity among children with disabilities: The district must have a minimum of 10 students of any race/ethnicity with IEPs enrolled. For districts meeting the n size threshold of 10, the number of students of any race/ethnicity suspended or expelled over 10 days must be greater than 1, and the rate of suspensions/expulsions over 10 days must be more than 3 standard deviations above the State's rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for students with disabilities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2024 using 2023-2024 data)

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

Data from the 2023-2024 report of children with disabilities subject to disciplinary removal were examined to determine if significant discrepancies were occurring in the rates of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days. For districts identified with significant discrepancies, Maine DOE reviews specific files from each district with a compliance instrument to test compliance of each student file or policy document. The purpose of this review is to ensure that districts are properly developing and implementing IEPs, use positive behavioral interventions and supports, and include procedural safeguards as outlined in 34 C.F.R. 300.170 (b). This review also ensures compliance with regulations including removals that constitute a change in placement, manifestation determination review, and provision of services during disciplinary removal. Each instance of noncompliance is required to be corrected and the Maine DOE requires the district to revise their policies and procedures to comply with IDEA and Maine Unified Special Education Regulations as well as participate in training provided by the Maine DOE.

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

If YES, select one of the following:

The State DID NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

Corrective action is pending and due June 1st, 2026.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

When the Data Manager flags an LEA with potential noncompliance in this area, the Supervision, Monitoring and Support team is notified. Once notified, the team communicates with the LEA and reviews all related files against a template document that helps maintain consistency across team members. This document examines and makes note of the following items: Student Name, DOB, Disability Category, Teacher/Case Manager, School, Behavior of

Concern, Date(s) of Removal, Length of Removal, Racial/Ethnic Group, Policies/Procedures/Practices, Documentation of Manifestation Determination, Documentation of FBA, and provision of services. This document identifies any trends or areas of concern or noncompliance. If noncompliance is identified, a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) is issued and is due as soon as possible, but no later than one year after the State's written notice of noncompliance, as outlined in OSEP memo 23-01. In FFY 2023, 3 LEAs were flagged by the Data Manager for potential noncompliance and the Supervision, Monitoring and Support team was notified. After following the process and reviewing these LEAs, they were identified as being noncompliant and findings of noncompliance were issued. Policies and procedures were reviewed, training for special education and general education administrators was provided by the Maine DOE, and the LEAs all demonstrated 100% compliance and closed their CAPs within one year after the written notifications of noncompliance, per OSEP memo 23-01. Because the LEAs are small and had no other students removed for >10 days, no systemic evidence was available to review as a subsequent data pull. The team also presents an annual, statewide training specific to disciplinary removals, which is recorded and posted on our professional learning web page for the entirety of the year. All PD is aligned with IDEA and the regulatory citations are included and referenced.

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

The team maintains an Excel document, called the Process Timeline, that outlines every step of the monitoring and supervision process. This process timeline has a tab where any findings for this indicator are documented, all notes, due dates and communication with each LEA are maintained. In FFY 2023, 3 LEAs were flagged by the Data Manager for potential noncompliance and the Supervision, Monitoring and Support team were notified. After following the process described above and reviewing these LEAs, all 3 were identified as being noncompliant and findings of noncompliance were issued. Policies and procedures were reviewed and training for special education and general education administrators was provided by the Maine DOE. Based on review of child-specific evidence submitted by the 3 LEAs in question, each LEA demonstrated correction and 100% compliance and closed their CAP within one year after the written notification of noncompliance, per OSEP memo 23-01.

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2023 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2023. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case or child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

Maine reported on the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY2023. Maine verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) and (2) corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. Maine has described the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2024, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2024 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2024, although its FFY 2024 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2024. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance

prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case or child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED^{Facts} file specification FS002.

Measurement

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80\% or more of the day)}}{\text{(total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40\% of the day)}}{\text{(total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements)}}{\text{(total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
A	2019	Target >=	70.00%	56.11%	56.11%	56.33%	56.33%
A	56.11%	Data	56.11%	54.92%	55.27%	55.72%	56.52%
B	2019	Target <=	9.00%	10.78%	10.42%	10.07%	9.71%
B	10.78%	Data	10.78%	11.06%	11.22%	10.92%	10.92%
C	2019	Target <=	3.10%	3.46%	3.46%	3.46%	3.34%
C	3.46%	Data	3.46%	3.49%	3.12%	3.10%	3.13%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target A >=	56.66%	57.00%
Target B <=	9.36%	9.00%
Target C <=	3.22%	3.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public.

This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative

of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.

Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.

Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the authorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.

Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

Maine continues to increase capacity for the participation of diverse groups of parents by developing advanced functionality of surveys, including the ability to participate in surveys by phone using a QR code and developing surveys and stakeholder input documents that are accessible to non-English speakers. Additionally, Maine continues to work with the Maine Parent Federation to reach underrepresented populations of parents and will include targeted sessions for underrepresented groups to ensure a diversity of represented stakeholders.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	34,798
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	19,980
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	3,736
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	991
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	95
SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/30/2025	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	25

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

NO

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	19,980	34,798	56.52%	56.66%	57.42%	Met target	No Slippage

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	3,736	34,798	10.92%	9.36%	10.74%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,111	34,798	3.13%	3.22%	3.19%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

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

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

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

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
A	Target >=		39.92%	42.54%	45.15%	47.78%
A	Data	39.92%	33.45%	32.90%	35.81%	37.62%
B	Target <=		24.24%	21.89%	19.54%	17.20%
B	Data	24.24%	25.91%	26.04%	24.55%	23.43%
C	Target <=		0.36%	0.36%	0.36%	0.36%
C	Data		0.36%	0.36%	0.13%	0.12%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public.

This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members

are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.

Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.

Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the authorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.

Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

Maine continues to increase capacity for the participation of diverse groups of parents by developing advanced functionality of surveys, including the ability to participate in surveys by phone using a QR code and developing surveys and stakeholder input documents that are accessible to non-English speakers. Additionally, Maine continues to work with the Maine Parent Federation to reach underrepresented populations of parents and will include targeted sessions for underrepresented groups to ensure a diversity of represented stakeholders.

Targets

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

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

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2024	2025
Target A >=	50.38%	53.00%
Target B <=	14.85%	12.50%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2024	2025
Target C <=	0.36%	0.30%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2024-25 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Early Childhood (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/30/2025

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	948	1,667	166	2,781

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	286	740	74	1,100
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	137	184	33	354
b2. Number of children attending separate school	127	121	15	263
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	4	0	1	5

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

NO

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,100	2,781	37.62%	50.38%	39.55%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility	617	2,781	23.43%	14.85%	22.19%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Home	5	2,781	0.12%	0.36%	0.18%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
A1	2008	Target >=	65.00%	66.50%	66.00%	66.50%	67.00%
A1	63.10%	Data	73.05%	67.94%	64.74%	71.10%	74.89%

A2	2008	Target >=	39.00%	39.00%	39.00%	39.00%	39.00%
A2	37.00%	Data	35.55%	35.28%	37.06%	41.57%	41.53%
B1	2008	Target >=	68.00%	68.33%	68.66%	68.99%	69.33%
B1	65.50%	Data	73.12%	69.44%	65.70%	70.32%	71.66%
B2	2008	Target >=	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%
B2	35.40%	Data	38.98%	35.85%	41.70%	46.02%	42.85%
C1	2008	Target >=	60.00%	61.33%	62.66%	64.00%	65.33%
C1	58.30%	Data	71.93%	68.52%	64.51%	69.05%	72.43%
C2	2008	Target >=	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%
C2	51.00%	Data	53.74%	51.74%	54.16%	55.43%	51.48%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	67.50%	68.00%
Target A2 >=	39.00%	39.00%
Target B1 >=	69.66%	70.00%
Target B2 >=	37.00%	37.00%
Target C1 >=	66.66%	68.00%
Target C2 >=	53.00%	53.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public.

This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.

Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.

Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the authorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.

Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

Maine continues to increase capacity for the participation of diverse groups of parents by developing advanced functionality of surveys, including the ability to participate in surveys by phone using a QR code and developing surveys and stakeholder input documents that are accessible to non-English

speakers. Additionally, Maine continues to work with the Maine Parent Federation to reach underrepresented populations of parents and will include targeted sessions for underrepresented groups to ensure a diversity of represented stakeholders.

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

2,432

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	13	0.53%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	585	24.05%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	846	34.79%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	581	23.89%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	407	16.74%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	1,427	2,025	74.89%	67.50%	70.47%	Met target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	988	2,432	41.53%	39.00%	40.63%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	11	0.45%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	639	26.27%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	776	31.91%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	558	22.94%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	448	18.42%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of	1,334	1,984	71.66%	69.66%	67.24%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$							
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1,006	2,432	42.85%	37.00%	41.37%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	15	0.62%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	554	22.78%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	637	26.19%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	481	19.78%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	745	30.63%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	1,118	1,687	72.43%	66.66%	66.27%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1,226	2,432	51.48%	53.00%	50.41%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B1	During FFY2024 Maine Child Development Services found that there were significant gaps in training for the Early Childhood Outcomes Center Child Outcomes Summary process. Additionally, Maine CDS continues to see an increasing number of children receiving services, a shortage of providers and significant staff turnover. Maine CDS and the cohort SAUs have begun implementing professional development focusing on standardized procedure for implementing the ECO COS. As a result of this Maine is now exploring the use of a single statewide early childhood outcome tool.
C1	During FFY2024 Maine Child Development Services found that there were significant gaps in training for the Early Childhood Outcomes Center Child Outcomes Summary process. Additionally, Maine CDS continues to see an increasing number of children receiving services, a shortage of providers and significant staff turnover. Maine CDS and the cohort SAU's have begun implementing professional development focusing on standardized procedure for implementing the ECO COS. As a result of this Maine is now exploring the use of a single statewide early childhood outcome tool.
C2	During FFY2024 Maine Child Development Services found that there were significant gaps in training for the Early Childhood Outcomes Center Child Outcomes Summary process. Additionally, Maine CDS continues to see an increasing number of children receiving services, a shortage of providers and significant staff turnover. Maine CDS and the cohort SAU's have begun implementing professional development focusing on standardized procedure for implementing the ECO COS. As a result of this Maine is now exploring the use of a single statewide early childhood outcome tool.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (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 system with validations to ensure every child has a COS form on file at entry and at exit from EI services if they have been in services for more than six months.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2024 response rate to the FFY 2023 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public.

This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.

Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.

Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the authorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.

Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

Maine continues to increase capacity for the participation of diverse groups of parents by developing advanced functionality of surveys, including the ability to participate in surveys by phone using a QR code and developing surveys and stakeholder input documents that are accessible to non-English speakers. Additionally, Maine continues to work with the Maine Parent Federation to reach underrepresented populations of parents and will include targeted sessions for underrepresented groups to ensure a diversity of represented stakeholders.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2006	87.40%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target >=	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%
Data	91.89%	92.46%	87.64%	86.28%	83.42%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target >=	91.00%	91.00%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
1,401	1,546	83.42%	91.00%	90.62%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

For the combined (school-age and preschool) percentage, the number of school-age and preschool respondents who indicated that schools facilitated parent involvement were summed and then divided by the sum of all school-age and preschool respondents. Preschool data (age 3-5) were gathered from a census of Child Development Services (CDS) sites. School-aged data were collected through monitoring activities; LEAs are assigned to cohorts that are monitored on a four year rotation, ensuring that each LEA is monitored once every four years. The data for CDS (pre-school) and DOE are reported jointly for this indicator because the targets have been set for combined CDS and DOE data. Representativeness was assessed for both CDS and DOE data using a +/-5% representativeness criterion for race/ethnicity and gender. Respondent data were found to be representative of the target population.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

17,496

Percentage of respondent parents

8.84%

Response Rate

FFY	2023	2024
Response Rate	7.03%	8.84%

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

The respondent representativeness was assessed for race/ethnicity and gender using the representativeness metric of +/- 5% of the population values. The analyses indicated that these respondent groups were representative of the target population.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

Analyses of the respondents' representativeness of the population were conducted for race/ethnicity and gender. Respondent data were found to be representative of the population of students with disabilities within the LEA population percentages for race/ethnicity and gender (demographics were all within 5% of the population values).

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

YES

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

Maine DOE attempts to reach all parents within the monitored cohort. Maine DOE provides an electronic link to the parent survey to all monitored LEAs, and LEAs provided the link to all parents of students with IEPs in the LEAs. For Child Development Services, a census has been conducted of all CDS sites. The response rate for FFY2024 was higher than the FFY2023 rate. Maine will strive for continuous improvement in communication with LEAs and CDS sites in soliciting parent input (e.g., provide email reminders for input and sharing parent survey results with LEAs) and in the analysis of underrepresented groups (e.g., potential redesign of random sample methodology). Maine continues to increase capacity for the participation of diverse groups of parents by developing advanced functionality of surveys, including the ability to participate in surveys by phone using a QR code and developing surveys and stakeholder input documents that are accessible to non-English speakers. Additionally, Maine continues to work with the Maine Parent Federation to reach underrepresented populations of parents and will include targeted sessions for underrepresented groups to ensure a diversity of represented stakeholders.

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

To identify potential sources of nonresponse bias, analyses of the sample's representativeness of the population of monitored districts were conducted for race/ethnicity and gender. Nonresponse bias occurs when there are groups that are underrepresented in the survey data and those groups differ from other respondents in their responses to the survey. Representativeness analyses indicated that respondents were represented within 5% with respect to race/ethnicity and gender. Therefore, nonresponse bias was not identified with respect to race/ethnicity and gender. Respondent data were found to be representative of the population of students with disabilities within the LEA population percentages for race/ethnicity and gender (within 5% of the population values). Attempts to increase the capacity for participation will include the added ability of respondents to participate by phone using a QR code and an expansion of potential participants beyond the current groups of monitored LEA cohorts. Additionally, to promote responses from a broader cross section of parents, Maine is working to make the survey available in multiple languages. The response rate and the relative percentage of parents who report that schools facilitated their involvement will continue to be monitored to assess potential nonresponse bias. When underrepresented groups are identified, analyses of non-response bias will be conducted to determine if the underrepresented groups differ significantly in their responses when compared to other groups that are represented to the extent that they exist in the population.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2024 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2025).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) 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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
-----	------	------

Target	0%	0%
--------	----	----

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

70

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	97	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

Disproportionate representation is defined as a significant difference between the identification rates of students with disabilities by race/ethnic proportion and the proportionate representation of the race/ethnicity overall within the district. A significant difference is defined as a risk ratio and an alternate risk ratio greater than or equal to 3 when comparing the risk of special education identification of students of a given race/ethnicity to the risk of special education identification of students of all other races/ethnicities. One year of data is used in the calculations. Multiple risk ratio measures and cell and n size criteria are used because the counts of students belonging to various racial/ethnic groups in Maine's districts often are very small. The cell size and n size of an assessed racial/ethnic group in special education must be at least 10 and 30, respectively, and a comparison group of any other racial/ethnic group in the district must be at least 10.

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

No districts exhibited disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education. Therefore, there was no review to determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. For districts exhibiting disproportionate representation, the Supervision and Monitoring team developed a grid where every student flagged for B9 is reviewed. The team gathers the following information on each student:

- Grade
- Disability
- Evaluator(s)
- Teacher/Case Manager
- School
- Evaluations Completed

Once this information is documented for each student, the team looks for patterns that might indicate disproportionate representation for special education. The team also reviews the districts' policies, procedures, and practices. This document includes a component that identifies students who are English Language Learners, in an effort to ensure all eligibility/re-eligibility decisions are based on appropriate referral and re-evaluation protocols specific to IDEA requirements. The purpose of this review is to ensure appropriate eligibility considerations, proper development and implementation of IEPs, and the inclusion of procedural safeguards.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

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

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), (e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures). In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2024 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2025).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group. Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) 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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

115

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	152	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

Disproportionate representation is defined as a significant difference between the rates of students identified for specific disability categories by race/ethnic proportion and the proportionate representation of the race/ethnicity overall within the district. A significant difference is defined as a risk ratio and an alternate risk ratio greater than or equal to 3 when comparing the risk of the identification of students of a given race/ethnicity in a disability category to the risk of identification of students of all other races/ethnicities. One year of data is used in the calculations. Multiple risk ratio measures and cell and n size criteria are used because the counts of students belonging to various racial/ethnic groups in Maine's districts often are very small. The cell size and n size of an assessed racial/ethnic group in a disability category must be at least 10 and 30, respectively, and a comparison group of any other racial/ethnic group in the district must be at least 10.

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

The Supervision and Monitoring team utilizes a grid where every student flagged for B10 is reviewed. The team gathered the following information on each student:

- Grade
- Disability
- Evaluators
- Teacher/Case Manager
- School
- Evaluations Completed

Once this information was documented for each student, the team looked for patterns that might indicate disproportionate representation in specific disability categories. The team also reviewed the districts' policies, procedures, and practices. This document includes a component that identifies students who are English Language Learners, in an effort to ensure all eligibility/re-eligibility decisions are based on appropriate referral and re-evaluation protocols specific to IDEA requirements. The purpose of this review is to ensure appropriate eligibility considerations, proper development and implementation of IEPs, and the inclusion of procedural safeguards.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

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

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response**10 - Required Actions**

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) 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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2023	82.23%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	92.52%	76.46%	68.18%	62.25%	82.23%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
376	315	82.23%	100%	83.78%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

61

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

Of the students included in (a) but not included in (b), 61 have completed initial evaluations, but they were not within the state-established timeline. 41 were less than 15 days late and 20 were more than 15 days late.

Reasons for these delays included lack of personnel resources to schedule and/or complete evaluation, lack of external evaluators in rural areas, and the external evaluator failed to meet evaluation timelines.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

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

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

LEAs are assigned to cohorts that are monitored on a rotation that varies between 2-6 years. This monitoring rotation is based on the Results Based Accountability System that the team implemented beginning with the 2022-2023 cohort. This follows all regulatory expectations around monitoring and ensures that the state monitors all LEAs within a reasonable period of time, and at least once within a six year period, as outlined in OSEP memo 23-01. B11 data were collected from the LEAs that were monitored during FFY2024 during the on-site monitoring review.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
51	51	0	0

FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Prior to considering any finding corrected, Maine DOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.301(c)(1) with 100% compliance based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance. In order to verify systemic correction, timelines were reviewed for referrals made subsequent to issuance of findings of noncompliance. To support maintenance of compliance and to facilitate completion of all corrective activity, the Supervision, Monitoring and Support developed a CAP Specific training that is specific for each LEA. This PD clarifies the reasons for each finding and outlines how to correct those findings. This is an optional offer, however, 100% of those in cohort chose to participate in this option. All corrective activity is consistent with OSEP memo 23-01.

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

To verify that each LEA correctly implemented the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.301(c)(1) with 100% compliance, the Supervision, Monitoring and Support team reviewed and verified subsequent updated data submitted by the LEAs as part of corrective activities. The team developed a Child Specific Findings document, that clearly outlined each individual finding and used this document to ensure that each individual student finding was corrected. To support maintenance of compliance and to facilitate completion of all corrective activity, the Supervision, Monitoring and Support developed a CAP Specific training that is specific for each LEA. This PD clarifies the reasons for each finding and outlines how to correct those findings. This is an optional offer, however, 100% of those in cohort chose to participate in this option. All corrective activity is consistent with OSEP memo 23-01. The time period within which each LEA with noncompliance was required to demonstrate 100% compliance was within one year of identification of noncompliance. All findings of noncompliance were demonstrated and verified as meeting 100% compliance within the one year of the identification of non-compliance. The monitoring team was able to verify that the evaluations were conducted for each child for whom consent was received, although outside of the required timeline. Evidence for the findings of noncompliance, including paper and digital copies of evaluations and written notices, were submitted to the Maine DOE and the content was verified by members of the monitoring team ensuring all evaluations met the criteria for Indicator 11.

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

Maine has reported on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023. Maine has reported that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. Maine has described the specific actions that were taken to verify the corrections.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2024, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2024, although its FFY 2024 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) 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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2024	82.86%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	88.44%	69.19%	65.12%	58.13%	50.87%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	42
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	4
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	29
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	3
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	29	35	50.87%	100%	82.86%	N/A	N/A

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

6

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

Number of children whose IEP was implemented beyond the third birthday:

1-15 days beyond: 1

16-30 days beyond: 1

31-60 days beyond: 2

60+ days beyond: 2

Reasons for these delays included lack of personnel resources to schedule and/or complete evaluation, lack of external evaluators in rural areas, and the external evaluator failed to meet evaluation timelines.

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

LEAs are assigned to cohorts that are monitored on a rotation that varies between 2-6 years. This monitoring rotation is based on the Results Based Accountability System that the team began implementing with the 2022-2023 cohort. This follows all regulatory expectations around monitoring and ensures that the state monitors all LEAs within a reasonable period of time, and at least once within a six year period, as outlined in OSEP memo 23-01. Data were collected from the LEAs that were monitored during FFY2024 during the on-site monitoring review.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In Maine, children ages 3 through 5 have been educated through Child Development Services (CDS). Beginning in FFY2024, the state has begun to transfer FAPE responsibility to LEAs. Per Maine statute, this process must be completed by July 1, 2028. Prior to FFY2024 CDS self-monitored and reported their own data for the Part B APR B12 Indicator. However, beginning with the current FFY2024 APR, Maine Department of Education now monitors and reports on all monitored cohort data for Indicator B12 - this includes monitoring and reporting on CDS data. With DOE monitoring and reporting on early childhood transition as part of the regularly-monitored cohort of LEAs, which includes CDS, this shift constitutes a change in the baseline for this indicator, as noted above.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
169	169	0	0

FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Prior to considering any finding from FFY2023 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.301(c)(1) and 34 CFR §§300.301(d) (exceptions to the timeline) based on updated data subsequently collected through the State data system and a manual review of data (achieving 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data in collaboration with each of the regional site directors; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the regional site. A review of children in the data system during the reporting period showed that 169 children that were identified as out of compliance during the

prior year's reporting period have since either been withdrawn by parents, moved out of the SAU's catchment area, or have had an Individualized Education Plan implemented. Maine DOE verified through updated data 100% compliance.

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

Based on a review of records in the statewide database of individual children who received early intervention and were referred to early childhood special education as a child potentially eligible for Part B, no children had not yet received an eligibility evaluation who were referred to Part B from Part C. Maine DOE verified as corrected 100% of individual noncompliance.

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

Maine has reported that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY2023 is: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. Maine has described the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

12 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2024, and OSEP accepts that revision.

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2024, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2024, although its FFY 2024 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) 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 2024 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2023), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2012	36.00%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	93.97%	36.73%	83.71%	80.77%	78.57%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
204	278	78.57%	100%	73.38%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The Supervision, Monitoring and Support team recognizes that there is slippage from 78.57% compliance rate in FFY2023 to 73.38% in FFY2024. This is due in part to the requirement for an "all or nothing" approach to reporting on the B13 indicator. When reviewing transition plans, the team has noticed that there will often be compliance on all but one component, which requires the entire transition plan to be reported as 0% compliant. What the team has seen is a shift between individual components in terms of compliance, and the need to shift training accordingly. In an effort to address this, the team has worked to maintain data on each individual component to track which areas are non-compliant, then offer very specific and focused training on those areas based on the needs of the state as a whole. The team continues to offer very individualized CAP specific trainings, which identify why there were findings, why those findings were non-compliant, and exactly how those findings need to be corrected. The team also presents an annual, statewide training specific to compliant transition plans, which is recorded and posted on our professional learning web page for the entirety of the year. All PD is aligned with IDEA and the regulatory citations are included and referenced.

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

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

LEAs are assigned to cohorts that are monitored on a rotation that varies between 2-6 years. This monitoring rotation is based on the Results Based Accountability System that the team began implementing for the 2022-2023 cohort. This follows all regulatory expectations around monitoring and ensures that the state monitors all LEAs within a reasonable period of time, and at least once within a six year period, as outlined in OSEP memo 23-01. Data were collected from the LEAs that were monitored during the FFY2024 on-site monitoring review.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	NO

If no, please explain

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
42	42	0	0

FFY 2023 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Prior to considering any finding from FFY2023 corrected, Maine DOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) with 100% compliance based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance consistent with OSEP memo 23-01. To verify that each LEA was correctly implementing the requirements, Maine DOE reviewed and verified subsequent data submitted by the LEAs through corrective action reports. These data demonstrated systemic correction of noncompliance. The time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance was within one year of the identification of the noncompliance. In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 23-01 Memorandum, Maine DOE also complied with the requirements to: account for all instances of noncompliance identified through monitoring procedures; identify the level, location, and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any LEA with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices. Each LEA submitted 100% compliant post-secondary transition plans developed after findings of noncompliance were issued. The team offers a CAP Specific training to each LEA during the two months after findings of noncompliance are issued to facilitate understanding of the requirements of IDEA and ensure compliance going forward. Each LEA within the cohort chose to participate in this training opportunity.

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

Prior to considering any finding from FFY2023 corrected, Maine DOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) with 100% compliance based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance consistent with OSEP memo 23-01. In instances when the child moves from one LEA to another within the state, the Supervision, Monitoring, and Support Team follows up with the child's new LEA to verify correction of noncompliance. LEAs with noncompliant plans reviewed during the monitoring cohort received a finding for post-secondary transition plans on their Corrective Action Plan (CAP). Although OSEP requires "all or nothing" reporting for all B13 plans, the Supervision, Monitoring and Support team still maintained data on individual components to track and document which areas were most challenging to the field and addressed those areas through more specific and direct training and PD. Because transition plan information can be corrected, the LEAs were required to convene IEP meetings to revise the plans to meet the

requirements in those cases where transition plans were found to be noncompliant. The amended plans with prior written notice were submitted to Maine DOE for review. When all instances of noncompliance were reviewed and found compliant, the LEA's finding was closed. The team developed a child specific document, that clearly outlined each individual finding and used this document to ensure that each individual student finding was corrected. All corrective activity is consistent with OSEP memo 23-01.

If procedures have been adopted that permit LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), describe how, for instances of noncompliance discovered in FFY 2023, the State verified: (1) that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements; and, (2) each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

Maine has reported on the status of correction of previous noncompliance and has verified that each LEA with previous noncompliance. (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 23-01. Maine hasdescribed the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2024, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2024, although its FFY 2024 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2025 on students who left school during 2023-2024, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2023-2024 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

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

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

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

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

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

II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

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

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2024 response rate to the FFY 2023 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
A	2016	Target ≥	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%
A	18.81%	Data	23.78%	16.92%	19.23%	17.65%	18.30%
B	2016	Target ≥	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
B	65.68%	Data	66.19%	64.62%	66.43%	58.33%	57.14%
C	2016	Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
C	77.56%	Data	76.50%	72.31%	74.13%	71.81%	72.77%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target A ≥	30.00%	30.00%
Target B ≥	80.00%	80.00%
Target C ≥	85.00%	85.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public.

This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B)

that serves children with disabilities from age three through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.

Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.

Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the authorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.

Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

Maine continues to increase capacity for the participation of diverse groups of parents by developing advanced functionality of surveys, including the ability to participate in surveys by phone using a QR code and developing surveys and stakeholder input documents that are accessible to non-English speakers. Additionally, Maine continues to work with the Maine Parent Federation to reach underrepresented populations of parents and will include targeted sessions for underrepresented groups to ensure a diversity of represented stakeholders.

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,468
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	277
Response Rate	18.87%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	52
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	93
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	17
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	20

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	52	277	18.30%	30.00%	18.77%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	145	277	57.14%	80.00%	52.35%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary	182	277	72.77%	85.00%	65.70%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)							

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B	Although the percentage of former students engaged in higher education has increased slightly, the overall percentage of former students engaged in competitive employment and other employment is lower than the previous year. Previously, the decrease in employment was offset by an increase in the pursuit of higher education, an increase in other postsecondary education, and other employment, resulting in an overall increase in engagement when summed across all categories. However, this reporting year departs from that pattern; therefore, percentages will continue to be monitored to determine if the FFY2024 percentage and subsequent rates indicate a pattern of overall systemic decrease for competitive and other employment.
C	Although the percentage of former students engaged in higher education has increased slightly, the overall percentage of former students engaged in competitive employment and other employment is lower than the previous year. Previously, the decrease in employment was offset by an increase in the pursuit of higher education, an increase in other postsecondary education, and other employment, resulting in an overall increase in engagement when summed across all categories. However, this reporting year departs from that pattern; therefore, percentages will continue to be monitored to determine if the FFY2024 percentage and subsequent rates indicate a pattern of overall systemic decrease for competitive and other employment.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

Response Rate

FFY	2023	2024
Response Rate	16.72%	18.87%

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

Representativeness is determined when the respondent rate for a given demographic exists at least to the extent as in the population or is within 5% of the population rate. Representativeness was assessed for disability and race/ethnicity.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The respondent representativeness of the population of exiters (youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school) was assessed for disability, and race/ethnicity. The analyses indicated that these groups were represented at least to the extent as in the population or were within 5% of the population percentages of exiters. The analysis indicates that the response group was representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

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

YES

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

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

Maine's response rate has increased in the current reporting year. DOE has augmented survey efforts to ensure that at least 2 attempts can be made to reach each former student. Additionally, Maine will continue to work with districts to convey the importance and use of the post-school survey to ensure the most recent district contact information is on file and will discuss possible use of additional methods of contact (e.g., mailings). Maine will also

discuss with LEAs the importance of representation of underrepresented groups of students. When underrepresented groups are identified, Maine will take extra efforts (e.g., additional phone call attempts) to reach representatives of these groups.

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

Maine has been vigilant in attempts to ensure representativeness across the State and analyzes data to minimize potential nonresponse bias. Maine continues to assess representativeness of respondents with respect to race/ethnicity and disability. Additionally, Maine attempts to contact all qualified exiters with contact information (rather than sample) to promote representation across a broad cross section of exiters. Nonresponse bias occurs when there are groups that are underrepresented in the survey data and those groups differ from other respondents in their responses to the survey. Representativeness analyses indicated that respondents were represented at least to the extent that they existed in the population or were within 5% of the population percentages of exiters with respect to race/ethnicity and disability. Therefore, nonresponse bias was not identified with respect to race/ethnicity or disability. When underrepresented groups are identified, Maine makes additional efforts (e.g., additional phone call attempts) to reach representatives of these groups. Further collaboration with parents, families, and internal and external stakeholders will support assessment of response bias. Additionally, Maine will leverage the Executive Student Transition (EST) Committee to further reach a representative population of students that have exited their secondary programs. When underrepresented groups are identified, analyses of non-response bias are conducted to determine if the underrepresented groups differ significantly in their responses when compared to other groups.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specifications FS229.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2024-25 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution - Due Process Complaints (ED <i>Facts</i> file spec FS229; Data group 896)	11/19/2025	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	3
SY 2024-25 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution - Due Process Complaints (ED <i>Facts</i> file spec FS229; Data group 896)	11/19/2025	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public.

This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided on opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.

Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.

Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the authorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.

Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to

LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

Maine continues to increase capacity for the participation of diverse groups of parents by developing advanced functionality of surveys, including the ability to participate in surveys by phone using a QR code and developing surveys and stakeholder input documents that are accessible to non-English speakers. Additionally, Maine continues to work with the Maine Parent Federation to reach underrepresented populations of parents and will include targeted sessions for underrepresented groups to ensure a diversity of represented stakeholders.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	57.00%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target >=	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%
Data		50.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target >=	58.00%	58.00%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
0	3	0.00%	58.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

States are not required to establish baselines or meet targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. When the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, states will develop a baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2024. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS228.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2024-25 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution - Mediation Requests (ED <i>Facts</i> file spec FS228; Data group 895)	11/19/2025	2.1 Mediations held	59
SY 2024-25 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution - Mediation Requests (ED <i>Facts</i> file spec FS228; Data group 895)	11/19/2025	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	20
SY 2024-25 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution - Mediation Requests (ED <i>Facts</i> file spec FS228; Data group 895)	11/19/2025	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	22

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public.

This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided an opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.

Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.

Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the authorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.

Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.

Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

Maine continues to increase capacity for the participation of diverse groups of parents by developing advanced functionality of surveys, including the ability to participate in surveys by phone using a QR code and developing surveys and stakeholder input documents that are accessible to non-English speakers. Additionally, Maine continues to work with the Maine Parent Federation to reach underrepresented populations of parents and will include targeted sessions for underrepresented groups to ensure a diversity of represented stakeholders.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	83.30%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Data	70.21%	67.39%	79.59%	75.00%	77.08%

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target >=	85.00%	85.00%

FFY 2024 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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
20	22	59	77.08%	85.00%	71.19%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The reason for slippage is not clear, however, the FFY2024 value is within the range of year-to-year variability, varying between 67.39% through 79.59% in recent years. However, the FFY2024 value of 71.19% is the largest reduction in recent years (from a FFY2023 value of 77.08%). The percentage of mediation agreements will continue to be monitored to determine if a year-to-year trend of slippage exists.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

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

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

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

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

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

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

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

A. Data Analysis

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

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2025). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2024 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2025, i.e., July 1, 2025-June 30, 2026).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2024 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2025, i.e., July 1, 2025-June 30, 2026) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

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

For the 2024-25 reporting year, the SSIP for the Maine Department of Education (Maine DOE) is the implementation of evidence-based professional development in the teaching of mathematics to improve the math proficiency of students with disabilities. This initiative has been named Math4ME ("Math for Maine"). The State-Identified Measurable Result (SiMR) is measured as follows: Students in grades 3–8 with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) will demonstrate improved math proficiency as measured by math scores on the statewide Maine Educational Assessment (MEA). Maine reports proficiency as follows: Percent = number of grade 3–8 students with IEPs who demonstrate proficiency in math divided by the number of grade 3–8 students with IEPs who are evaluated on the math assessment.

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

NO

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

YES

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

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

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

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

https://docs.google.com/document/d/e/2PACX-1vQ9x-fKoV7OoSZwFS9etnwl3A7u_kNqdcpygRhS3Pzdeis6NeCZuotpT3Z4bizklg/pub

Progress toward the SiMR

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

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

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2022	18.09%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	20.09%	21.09%

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Math Proficient Students with Disabilities Grades 3-8	Students with Disabilities who Tested in Math Grades 3-8	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
2,903	15,424	18.01%	20.09%	18.82%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2024 data.

Maine began using a new statewide math assessment (NWEA) in the 2020-2021 school year. Because the statewide assessment changed in FFY2020, proficiency rates based on the statewide assessment for FFY2020 constituted a new baseline. The NWEA administration in 2020-21 was a field test, and modifications to the method of scaling and benchmarking to determine proficiency were expected for the FFY2021 assessment. However, modifications/standardization of the scaling and benchmarking methods was delayed through FFY2021. The modifications and standardizations of scaling and benchmarking were instituted in FFY2022 and constituted a new baseline, therefore Maine updated targets for FFY2023 and subsequent years.

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

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

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

NO

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

NO

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

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

The Math4ME logic model includes the state's current evaluation plan: https://docs.google.com/document/d/e/2PACX-1vQ9x-fKoV7OoSZwFS9etnwl3A7u_kNqdcpygRhS3Pzdeis6NeCZuotpT3Z4bizklg/pub

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

NO

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

Garrett Consulting

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

Math Trainers & Coaches

Math4ME hosts training over the summer in person and remotely throughout the year. Additionally the Math4ME trainers and coaches are spending significant amounts of time in schools as the program shifted to a statewide initiative. The Maine DOE Math Inclusion Specialist, Jennifer Robitaille, serves as the Math4ME project lead trainer. She brings a wealth of experience and math content and pedagogical expertise to the Maine DOE and collaborates with Math4ME lead coach, Susan Hogan. Susan is a distinguished educator supporting Math4ME with training and coaching. She also comes to the project with years of mathematics teaching and leadership.

Math4ME Advisory Group

The Math4ME advisory group consists of special educators, special education directors, school administrators and representatives from the Maine Department of Education, the external evaluators and Maine Parent Federation. A member of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report State Advisory Panel and higher-education faculty are also a part of the group. This group has meets quarterly to deepen the engagement in Math4ME programming and decision making.

State Leadership Team (SLT)

A component of the state personnel development grant is the convening of a state leadership team to provide guidance on building capacity and sustainability for the grant projects. The SLT is embedded in the state advisory panel (SAP). The SAP/SLT includes leadership from across the Maine Department of Education which assists with collaboration and breaking down department silos, family members, self-advocates, higher education, the Department of Labor, special education directors and interested members of the public. The SAP meets monthly and quarterly serves as the SLT.

LEA Administrators & Teachers

The participating Local Education Agencies (LEAs) were selected based on an application process that assessed readiness and capacity to institute evidence-based improvement practices in teaching mathematics. The Math4ME project shifted to a school-wide approach with teams of administrators, educators (general and special) and paraprofessionals engaging in the work and then implementing the practices with all school building faculty and staff.

Federal Technical Assistance

Maine continued to benefit greatly from the support and assistance of OSEP-funded technical assistance centers. The IDEA Data Center and other agencies have provided indispensable guidance, consultation, and coordination through all steps of Maine's SSIP development and implementation. The Maine team has also participated in state personnel development grant (SPDG) director meetings and communities of practice addressing implementation and sustainability.

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

Accountability/Monitoring

External evaluation: The addition of Garrett Consulting to the external evaluation team for the SPDG continues to monitor Math4ME's accountability and progress.

Professional Development

Trainers & Coaches: Jennifer Robitaille, the Math4ME lead and math inclusion specialist and Susan Hogan have years of experience working with Maine educators and both have significant expertise in mathematical training and coaching. The professional development that they provide will lead to student learning and therefore achievement of the SiMR. The training and coaching they provide will lead to educators' increased knowledge of fundamental concepts and pedagogy, improved skill of teachers in teaching fundamental concepts in mathematics, increase the number of students with disabilities exposed to research-based teaching practices and will increase proficiency in math for students with disabilities in grades 3-8. This will be evident in NWEA student assessment data, teacher surveys, and fidelity of practice data.

Math4ME Cohort Teams: Each schoolwide team consists of a school administrator, general & special education teachers & paraprofessionals with one teacher identified as a Teacher of Influence (TOI) who serves as a team leader and coach. By focusing on a schoolwide implementation team, students will be exposed to research-based teaching practices in fundamental concepts in math consistently. The team's understanding of math best practices will increase proficiency in math for students with disabilities in their classrooms.

Governance

Advisory Group: The continued guidance and accountability by the stakeholder group will support sustainability. Additionally, the leadership from the state advisory panel will support the building of capacity and sustainability of the work.

Technical Assistance

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

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

NO

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

A new SSIP and SiMR are being discussed with the state advisory panel, stakeholder groups, OSEP TA centers and leadership at the Maine Department of Education. The new SiMR will be formally formulated and stated in the next APR. The proposed SSIP for the next APR continues to be indicator 3 with a focus on academics as a part of indicator 5 education environments in least restrictive environments.

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

Math4ME training is grounded in the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) Mathematics Teaching Practices. This training includes hands-on activities and interactive professional learning experiences that allow participants to gain a deeper understanding of core mathematics concepts and strategies. Program content includes problem-solving skills and processes; and assessment, diagnostic probes, and formative feedback. It includes Math4ME professional learning sessions, Professional Learning Community (PLC) for Teachers of Influence (TOI), and Coaching.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practice.

Professional Learning Sessions

Math4ME training consisted of summer in person sessions and throughout the year remote, synchronous interactive professional learning experiences. The sessions focused on training schoolwide teams including general and special education teachers from elementary and middle school grade bands, a school administrator and paraprofessionals in the fundamental concepts of math content and pedagogy with a focus on the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) principles and standards. Math4ME trainers/coaches also provided analysis of school inventory results with schoolwide teams, methods of evaluating students for math levels to report strengths and needs, and other supports as requested by the school. Numerous resources relevant to math content and pedagogy are shared throughout the in person and virtual trainings.

Professional Learning Communities (PLC) for Teachers of Influence (TOI)

Each Math4ME schoolwide team has a Teacher of Influence (TOI) who acts as a team leader and coach to support the Math4ME professional learning and coaching done by the Math4ME lead trainers and coaches. The goal of the PLCs is to provide additional supports for the TOIs, create a safe place for conversations about mathematical practices and provide additional supports for schoolwide implementation of Math4ME. The smaller group interactive activities further support collaboration, feedback and reflection. Learning activities in both PL and PLC sessions use a range of modes including interactive sorts, reviewing student work, learning through video cases, and engaging in mathematics.

Coaching

Coaching is provided for both the school teams and the TOIs. The coaching for the school team focuses on the schoolwide inventory that includes schoolwide and classroom evidence based math practices, examples of family engagement and inclusionary practices. TOIs are individually supported with coaching through school/classroom visits, observations with feedback and modeling. In addition to coaching, participants are supported with ad-hoc assistance from the state trainers/coaches and are provided with numerous technical assistance resources. Coaches provide in person and virtual opportunities for conversations about mathematic instructional practices and informal observations with feedback. The continued practice of developing teachers', administrators and paraprofessionals' conceptual understanding of mathematics and mathematics instruction through professional learning and coaching will lead to a change in classroom practices. This advanced mathematical understanding and pedagogy will lead to gains in student learning.

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

Professional learning sessions and coaching are provided to school teams of administrators, general and special educators and paraprofessionals throughout the entire school year. In moving to a school wide year long approach, educators and paraprofessionals will have time in between sessions to implement math strategies and routines. In between these sessions, the TOI PLCs meet. In these meetings participants bring examples of their practices to share and discuss with the group. This time of reflection on practice will strengthen the participants understanding of the math principles which will lead to the improved skills of special educators in teaching fundamental concepts in math. Coaching will further support the educators' understanding and implementation skills.

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

The Teachers of Influence Observation Tool was used to document evidence of increased coaching and support provided by Math4ME trained teachers of influence around mathematical content, pedagogy, inclusion, and culture. Observations were completed by Math4ME coaches to assess the fidelity of implementation of practices supported by Math4ME. Observation content areas included:

- School/Classroom Culture - Positive Attitude Towards Mathematics
- Inclusionary Practices
- Appropriate Mathematics Content
- Use of National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Teaching (NCTM) Practices

The Math4ME coaches used the follow rating definitions:

1 = No evidence — Not yet observed.

2 = Some evidence — TOI makes brief attempt but not consistently observed, low proficiency.

3 = Evidence — TOI uses the strategy fairly consistently and with satisfactory skill or proficiency.

4 = Strong evidence — TOI consistently uses the strategy with a high level of skill or proficiency.

N/A = Not applicable — The instructional strategy could not reasonably be included in the lesson as planned.

The final TOI Observation Tool data were collected from 11 TOIs in March 2025 by the Math4ME coaches. To achieve fidelity, the average rating must be 3.00 or higher. Four of the 11 (36%) TOIs had an average fidelity rating above 3.00. The average TOI Observation Tool score for all TOIs was 2.42. Practices within the Use of Appropriate Mathematics Content domain were observed most frequently (m=2.86), while the use of NCTM Teaching Practices was observed the least (m=2.18). Within the Inclusionary Practices domain, the most evidence was observed for the degree to which all students had entry points to classroom math experiences (m=2.78). The least observed practice was the degree to which strength-based language was used (m=2.00). As many of the TOIs serve as instructional coaches and did not have a specific classroom they teach, this practice was not applicable for eight of the 13 TOIs. Evidence also was found for the use of accurate mathematical language with all students (m=3.17). Similar levels of evidence were observed for the use of accurate math content aligned with grade level standards (m=2.71) and for the use of a variety of math routines promoted by Math4ME with students (m=2.70). The NCTM Teaching Practices observed most frequently were the facilitation of meaningful mathematical discourse (m=2.50) and eliciting and using evidence of student thinking (m=2.33) (Chart 5). Conversely, less evidence was found for the establishment of mathematics goals to focus reasoning (m=1.38).

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

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

For the next reporting period the state is considering a new SiMR focused on Indicators 3 Assessment and 5 Education Environments. This is under discussion with the state advisory panel, state leadership, OSEP TA, and stakeholder groups including higher education, local education agencies, educators, families and self-advocates. The evidence based practices being proposed and finalized before the next APR include the development of a framework for supporting students with disabilities in least restrictive educational environments, creation of district and school leadership networks for learning and action planning, professional development for educators and administrators in high leverage practices (HLPs) by the CEEDAR center, an OSEP technical assistance organization. Statewide symposia, webinars and a conference will provide additional learning and supports for the state of Maine. A pilot project for intensive supports for schools will also be considered for development.

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

NO

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

For the next reporting period the state is considering a new SiMR focused on Indicators 3 Assessment and 5 Education Environments. This is under discussion with the state advisory panel, state leadership, OSEP TA, and stakeholder groups including higher education, local education agencies, educators, families and self-advocates. Educational environment targets for Indicator 5 have not been reached and percentages have been relatively unchanged without progress for the past decade. The evidence based practices being proposed and finalized before the next APR include the

development of a framework for supporting students with disabilities in least restrictive educational environments, creation of district and school leadership networks for learning and action planning, professional development for educators and administrators in high leverage practices (HLPs) by the CEDAR center, an OSEP technical assistance organization. Statewide symposia, webinars and a conference will provide additional learning and supports for the state of Maine. A pilot project for intensive supports for schools will also be considered for development.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

Data analysis, target-setting, and implementation planning activities related to Annual Performance Report (APR) and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) consisted of meetings of Maine DOE staff, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), conference presentations for special educators and administrators, and broad outreach to special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the public.

This outreach included parent sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation and recorded videos and live-remote (Zoom) sessions covering indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The indicator-specific videos and related surveys provided an opportunity for broad-based public participation and input on targets. The videos and surveys were developed in collaboration with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF).

IDEA requires that each state establish a State Advisory Panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. The Part B State Advisory Panel provides advice on the implementation of the IDEA program (Part B) that serves children with disabilities from age three through 21. Members are appointed by the Governor. The panel consists of 13 people. Six members are parents of children with a disability or individuals with a disability. Representation/roles of members include a teacher; a representative of an institution of higher education that prepares special education/related services personnel; a State official who carries out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; two administrators of programs for children with disabilities; a representative of a State agency (Department of Health and Human Services) involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities; a representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities; a representative of a public charter school; and a representative from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies. Additionally, Maine DOE is currently recruiting for a member to represent the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care. The SAP is a strong representation of community stakeholders.

Maine DOE staff, including the Director of the Office of Special Services, the Part B Data Manager, and the Special Projects Coordinator, met with the SAP during monthly meetings in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the new State Performance Plan and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP.

Statewide meetings of the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC) were held in 2020 and 2021 to discuss the authorization of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance report and the new alignment of indicators. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting for performance indicators, including the SSIP. Attendees were also provided links to surveys in which they identified and prioritized LEA-level initiatives related to APR performance indicators and provided suggestions related to APR implementation strategies.

Additional parent and broad-based public input was gathered through live sessions conducted by the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) and recorded videos and associated surveys hosted on the Maine DOE website. The videos were advertised in Maine DOE electronic publications and messages to LEA teachers and administrators and participation was also promoted by MPF staff. The live sessions and recorded videos covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and each video was linked to a survey for input on target-setting. Past performance for the indicator was compared with previous baseline measures, and the reasons for new baselines (if applicable) was discussed. Potential targets were suggested based on performance trajectories from previous years and new indicator parameters (when applicable).

Maine continues to increase capacity for the participation of diverse groups of parents by developing advanced functionality of surveys, including the ability to participate in surveys by phone using a QR code and developing surveys and stakeholder input documents that are accessible to non-English speakers. Additionally, Maine continues to work with the Maine Parent Federation to reach underrepresented populations of parents and will include targeted sessions for underrepresented groups to ensure a diversity of represented stakeholders.

The last APR identified that stakeholders, including the Math4ME advisory, had continuing concerns about scaling up, sustainability and retention for the project. To address these concerns, stakeholders were brought together throughout 2024 and 2025 to plan how to address the issues. These stakeholders included the state advisory panel (SAP), the Math4ME advisory group, Maine DOE staff from across offices (Federal team, Teaching & Learning, School & Student Supports and Career & Workforce Development), higher education (University of Maine system and private institutions), local education agencies' administrators, general and special educators, families and self-advocates.

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

The stakeholder groups were convened in multiple in person and virtual meetings to discuss how to best serve students with disabilities in Maine. The areas of need identified by these groups were systemic in nature and include school vision and climate, system processes, schedule and structure of the school day, family and community engagement, instructional practices, accountability and supports. These groups reviewed longitudinal educational environment data and created a draft of a framework for the state to consider creating educational environments for students with disabilities that provides greater access to the general education classroom, curriculum, standards, social interactions with peers and the community. The intention of the stakeholder groups is to create a framework for districts and schools to use to ensure least restrictive educational environments and opportunities for students with disabilities in the preK-12 settings and better academic and post-secondary outcomes for Maine students.

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

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

The concerns of the stakeholders led to conversations about a shift in focus from only math to creating educational environments that are least restrictive for students with disabilities, addressing Indicator 5. In addition, it is proposed that changes in schools that increase LRE rates for students in the regular class more than 80% of the day will lead to better academic outcomes (indicator 3) and, in the long term, better post-secondary outcomes (indicator 14).

Additional Implementation Activities

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

During the 2025-2026 school year Math4ME activities will continue. Additional activities for a new SiMR are in pilot stages until a formal decision is made with intensive input from stakeholders.

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

A new timeline, data collection and measures, and identified outcomes will be created spring 2026 and will be available for the next APR.

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

Barriers for the new SiMR being discussed will be outlined and addressed in the next APR.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions

Indicator 18: General Supervision

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Compliance indicator: This SPP/APR indicator focuses on the State's exercise of its general supervision responsibility to monitor its local educational agencies (LEAs) for requirements under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) through the State's reporting on timely correction of noncompliance (20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(11) and 1416(a); and 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.149, 300.600). In reporting on findings under this indicator, the State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State.

Data Source

The State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. Include all findings of noncompliance regardless of the specific type and extent of noncompliance.

Measurement

This SPP/APR indicator requires the reporting on the percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- # of findings of noncompliance issued the prior Federal fiscal year (FFY) (e.g., for the FFY 2024 submission, use FFY 2023, July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024)
- # of findings of noncompliance the State verified were corrected no later than one year after the State's written notification of findings of noncompliance.

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

Instructions

Targets must be 100%.

States are required to complete the General Supervision Data Table within the online reporting tool.

Report in Column A, the number of findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2023 (July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024), as reported in the compliance indicator, and report in Column C1, the number of those findings which were timely corrected, as soon as possible and in no case later than one year after the State's written notification of noncompliance. Report in Column B, the number of additional findings of noncompliance related to the compliance indicator made in FFY 2023 (July 1, 2023–June 30, 2024) and report in Column C2, the number of those additional findings related to the compliance indicator which were timely corrected, as soon as possible and in no case later than one year after the State's written notification of noncompliance.

States may also provide additional information related to other findings of noncompliance that are not specific to the compliance indicators. This row would include reporting on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported by the State under the compliance indicators listed below (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.). In future years (e.g., with the FFY 2026 SPP/APR), States may be required to further disaggregate findings by results indicators (1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17), fiscal and other areas.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous findings of 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 and the actions that have been taken or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

18 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2024	99.26%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data					Not Valid and Reliable

Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%

Indicator 4B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
3	0	3	0	0

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

Not applicable

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

When the Data Manager flags an LEA with potential noncompliance in this area, the Supervision, Monitoring and Support team is notified. Once notified, the team communicates with the LEA and reviews all related files against a template document that helps maintain consistency across team members. This document examines and makes note of the following items: Student Name, DOB, Disability Category, Teacher/Case Manager, School, Behavior of Concern, Date(s) of Removal, Length of Removal, Racial/Ethnic Group, Policies/Procedures/Practices, Documentation of Manifestation Determination, Documentation of FBA, and provision of services. This document identifies any trends or areas of concern or noncompliance. If noncompliance is identified, a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) is issued and is due as soon as possible, but no later than one year after the State's written notice of noncompliance, as outlined in OSEP memo 23-01. In FFY 2023, 3 LEAs were flagged by the Data Manager for potential noncompliance and the Supervision, Monitoring and Support team was notified. After following the process and reviewing these LEAs, they were identified as being noncompliant and findings of noncompliance were issued. Policies and procedures were reviewed, training for special education and general education administrators was provided by the Maine DOE, and the LEAs all demonstrated 100% compliance and closed their CAPs within one year after the written notifications of noncompliance, per OSEP memo 23-01. Because the LEAs are small and had no other students removed for >10 days, no systemic evidence was available to review as a subsequent data pull. The team also presents an annual, statewide training specific to disciplinary removals, which is recorded and posted on our professional learning web page for the entirety of the year. All PD is aligned with IDEA and the regulatory citations are included and referenced.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

The team maintains an Excel document, called the Process Timeline, that outlines every step of the monitoring and supervision process. This process timeline has a tab where any findings for this indicator are documented, all notes, due dates and communication with each LEA are maintained. In FFY 2023, 3 LEAs were flagged by the Data Manager for potential noncompliance and the Supervision, Monitoring and Support team were notified. After following the process described above and reviewing these LEAs, all 3 were identified as being noncompliant and findings of noncompliance were issued. Policies and procedures were reviewed and training for special education and general education administrators was provided by the Maine DOE. Based on review of child-specific evidence submitted by the 3 LEAs in question, each LEA demonstrated correction and 100% compliance and closed their CAP within one year after the written notification of noncompliance, per OSEP memo 23-01.

Indicator 9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0	0	0	0	0

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

Not applicable

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

Not applicable

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

Not applicable

Indicator 10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0	0	0	0	0

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

Not applicable

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

Not applicable

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

Not applicable

Indicator 11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
51	2	51	1	1

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

The difference between the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 11 is due to related findings in dispute resolution. There were two due process cases with findings related to indicator 11.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

Prior to considering any finding corrected, Maine DOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.301(c)(1) with 100% compliance based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance. In order to verify systemic correction, timelines were reviewed for referrals made subsequent to issuance of findings of noncompliance. To support maintenance of compliance and to facilitate completion of all corrective activity, the Supervision, Monitoring and Support developed a CAP Specific training that is specific for each LEA. This PD clarifies the reasons for each finding and outlines how to correct those findings. This is an optional offer, however, 100% of those in cohort chose to participate in this option. All corrective activity is consistent with OSEP memo 23-01.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

To verify that each LEA correctly implemented the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.301(c)(1) with 100% compliance, the Supervision, Monitoring and Support team reviewed and verified subsequent updated data submitted by the LEAs as part of corrective activities. The team developed a Child Specific Findings document, that clearly outlined each individual finding and used this document to ensure that each individual student finding was corrected. To support maintenance of compliance and to facilitate completion of all corrective activity, the Supervision, Monitoring and Support developed a CAP Specific training that is specific for each LEA. This PD clarifies the reasons for each finding and outlines how to correct those findings. This is an optional offer, however, 100% of those in cohort chose to participate in this option. All corrective activity is consistent with OSEP memo 23-01. The time period within which each LEA with noncompliance was required to demonstrate 100% compliance was within one year of identification of noncompliance. All findings of noncompliance were demonstrated and verified as meeting 100% compliance within the one year of the identification of non-compliance. The monitoring team was able to verify that the evaluations were conducted for each child for whom consent was received, although outside of the required timeline. Evidence for the findings of noncompliance, including paper and digital copies of evaluations and written notices, were submitted to the Maine DOE and the content was verified by members of the monitoring team ensuring all evaluations met the criteria for Indicator 11.

The Maine Department of Education (MDOE) maintained documentation of each child-specific case of non-compliance. The MDOE verified that, in one of the cases, non-compliance was corrected within a year from the date it was identified.

For Dispute Resolution: Each individual corrective action plan was monitored on an ongoing basis. The MDOE monitored via email, and phone calls and collected evidence (e.g., written notices, emails, phone call logs, a copy of the evaluation), as required by the CAPs. Follow up emails and phone calls were made to the LEAs to monitor status of the CAPs. Through the collection of the data, and updated data received by the Dispute Resolution Team, the MDOE verified that for one of the LEAs, there was 100% compliance for CAP closure within a year.

Indicator 12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
169	0	169	0	0

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

Not applicable

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:

Prior to considering any finding from FFY2023 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.301(c)(1) and 34 CFR §§300.301(d) (exceptions to the timeline) based on updated data subsequently collected through the State data system and a manual review of data (achieving 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data in collaboration with each of the regional site directors; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the regional site. A review of children in the data system during the reporting period showed that 169 children that were identified as out of compliance during the prior year's reporting period have since either been withdrawn by parents, moved out of the SAU's catchment area, or have had an Individualized Education Plan implemented. Maine DOE verified through updated data 100% compliance.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected:

Based on a review of records in the statewide database of individual children who received early intervention and were referred to early childhood special education as a child potentially eligible for Part B, no children had not yet received an eligibility evaluation who were referred to Part B from Part C. Maine DOE verified as corrected 100% of individual noncompliance.

Indicator 13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age-appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services and needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
42	2	42	1	1

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any additional findings reported in Column B.

The difference between the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 13 is due to related findings in dispute resolution. There were two due process cases with findings related to indicator 13.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:

For Monitoring: Prior to considering any finding from FFY2023 corrected, Maine DOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) with 100% compliance based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance consistent with OSEP memo 23-01. To verify that each LEA was correctly implementing the requirements, Maine DOE reviewed and verified subsequent data submitted by the LEAs through corrective action reports. These data demonstrated systemic correction of noncompliance. The time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance was within one year of the identification of the noncompliance. In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 23-01 Memorandum, Maine DOE also complied with the requirements to: account for all instances of noncompliance identified through monitoring procedures; identify the level, location, and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any LEA with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices. Each LEA submitted 100% compliant post-secondary transition plans developed after findings of noncompliance were issued.

The team offers a CAP Specific training to each LEA during the two months after findings of noncompliance are issued to facilitate understanding of the requirements of IDEA and ensure compliance going forward. Each LEA within the cohort chose to participate in this training opportunity.

For Dispute Resolution: The two LEAs where sources of noncompliance were found were issued CAPs. Both LEAs were required to follow the regulatory procedures for completion of the post-secondary transition plans. For the required updated data, the MDOE provided technical assistance and guidance for the collection of the evidence. The MDOE verified the data from both LEAs, including emails, multiple copies of written notices, revised IEPs, and evaluation reports. In addition, the MDOE received copies of staff training curricula. For both LEAs, the MDOE provided additional technical assistance via training on the regulatory procedures post-secondary transition plans. The materials were prepared and delivered by MDOE employees with expertise in post-secondary transition planning, and dispute resolution. Through the collection of the data, and updated data received by the Dispute Resolution Team, the MDOE verified that for one of the LEAs, there was 100% compliance for CAP closure within a year.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

Prior to considering any finding from FFY2023 corrected, Maine DOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) with 100% compliance based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance consistent with OSEP memo 23-01. In instances when the child moves from one LEA to another within the state, the Supervision, Monitoring, and Support Team follows up with the child's new LEA to verify correction of noncompliance. LEAs with noncompliant plans reviewed during the monitoring cohort received a finding for post-secondary transition plans on their Corrective Action Plan (CAP). Although OSEP requires "all or nothing" reporting for all B13 plans, the Supervision, Monitoring and Support team still maintained data on individual components to track and document which areas were most challenging to the field and addressed those areas through more specific and direct training and PD. Because transition plan information can be corrected, the LEAs were required to convene IEP meetings to revise the plans to meet the requirements in those cases where transition plans were found to be noncompliant. The amended plans with prior written notice were submitted to Maine DOE for review. When all instances of noncompliance were reviewed and found 100% compliant, the LEA's finding was closed. The team developed a child specific document, that clearly outlined each individual finding and used this document to ensure that each individual student finding was corrected. All corrective activity is consistent with OSEP memo 23-01.

For Dispute Resolution: The Maine Department of Education (MDOE) maintained documentation of each child-specific case of non-compliance. The MDOE verified that, in one of the cases, non-compliance was corrected within a year from the date it was identified. Each individual corrective action plan was regularly monitored. The MDOE monitored via email, and phone calls and collected evidence (e.g., written notices, emails, phone call logs, copies of written notices, revised IEPs, copies of letters to the families), as required by the CAPs. Follow up emails and phone calls were made to the LEAs to monitor status of the CAPs. Through the collection of the data, and updated data received by the Dispute Resolution Team, the MDOE verified that for one of the LEAs, there was 100% compliance for CAP closure within a year.

Optional for FFY 2024 and 2025:

Other Areas - All other findings: States may report here on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported under the compliance indicators listed above (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.).

Column B: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected

Please explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any findings reported in this section:

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

Total for All Noncompliance Identified (Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and Optional Areas):

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 (7/1/23 – 6/30/24)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
265	4	265	2	2

FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data

Number of findings of Noncompliance that were timely corrected	Number of findings of Noncompliance that were identified FFY 2023	FFY 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
267	269	Not Valid and Reliable	100%	99.26%	N/A	N/A

Percent of findings of noncompliance not corrected or not verified as corrected within one year of identification	0.74%
---	-------

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Summary of Findings of Noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 Corrected in FFY 2024 (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State identified during FFY 2023 (the period from July 1, 2023 through June 30, 2024)	269
2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of written notification to the LEA of the finding)	267
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year	2

Subsequent Correction: Summary of All Outstanding Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023 Not Timely Corrected in FFY 2024 (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of findings of noncompliance not timely corrected	2
5. Number of findings in Col. A the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline for Indicator 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 ("subsequent correction")	0
6a. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 4B	0
6b. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 9	0
6c. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 10	0
6d. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 11	0
6e. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 12	0
6f. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 13	1
6g. (optional) Number of written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - All other findings	0
7. Number of findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected	1

Subsequent correction: If the State did not ensure timely correction of previous findings of noncompliance, provide information on the nature of any continuing noncompliance and the actions that have been taken, or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

Indicator 11 - Dispute Resolution - Two LEAs that had findings of non-compliance for indicator 11. A review of updated data identified one LEA with a finding of non-compliance in a state complaint investigation. The SEA verified that the finding of non-compliance for that LEA was 100% corrected within a year. The other LEA with a finding of non-compliance in a due process hearing decision has not been fully corrected. The MDOE verified that after receiving signed consent from the parent, and after the data collected verified several attempts to schedule a time and place for the student to be evaluated, the LEA was in compliance consistent with IDEA Section 1414(a)(1)(C)(ii)(II), namely "the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation." As a result, the SEA will verify in the FFY2025 SPP/APR that the remaining finding for that LEA and CAP that was not closed within a year will be 100% in compliance and closed.

Indicator 13 - Dispute Resolution - The LEA with noncompliance that was not fully corrected within a year was fully corrected within a year and three months. The MDOE verified that there was 100% compliance for CAP closure for this LEA. The SEA will take action to ensure that all subsequent required trainings for LEAs are held within one year from the date of the findings.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2023

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2023 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

18 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2024 in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR.

The State must establish baseline for this indicator in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR.

Response to actions required in FFY 2023 SPP/APR

Maine has provided valid and reliable data for this indicator and has established a FFY2024 baseline.

18 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2024, and OSEP accepts that revision.

18 - Required Actions

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 was corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2024 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2023: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Erin Frazier

Title:

State Director of Special Services

Email:

erin.frazier@maine.gov

Phone:

2074462775

Submitted on:

04/23/26 8:26:37 AM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

Maine 2026 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
59.09%	Needs Intervention

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	10	50.00%
Compliance	22	15	68.18%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2026: Part B."

2026 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2)	Grade 4	Data Not Reported	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	Data Not Reported	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	20%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	95%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	27%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	95%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 4	Data Not Reported	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	Data Not Reported	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	41%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	94%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	22%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	92%	1

(2) Statewide assessments include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment.

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	18	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma*	81	2

*When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, "the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential."

2026 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (3)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2023 (4)	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	1.02%	YES	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	83.78%	YES	1
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	82.86%	YES	1
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	73.38%	YES	0
Indicator 18: General Supervision	99.26	NO	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	87.22%		1
Timely State Complaint Decisions	43.75%		0
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

(3) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at:

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/FFY2024-Part-B-SPP-APR-Reformatted-Measurement-Table.pdf>

(4) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are >=5% and <10% for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and >=90% and <95% for Indicators 11, 12, 13 and 18.

Data Rubric

Maine

FFY 2024 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	0	0
3B	0	0
3C	0	0
3D	0	0
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1
18	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	18
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2024 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	23

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 7/30/25	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/18/26	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/18/26	1	0	1	2
Discipline Due Date: 2/18/26	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/7/26	0	N/A	N/A	0
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/19/25	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 11/19/25	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	17
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.28571429) =	21.86

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.28571429 points are subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	23
B. 618 Grand Total	21.86
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	44.86
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	2.57
Denominator	51.43
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	0.8722
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	87.22

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.28571429.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2026 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described in the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	FS002 & FS089	7/30/2025
Part B Personnel	FS070, FS099, FS112	2/18/2026
Part B Exiting	FS009	2/18/2026
Part B Discipline	FS005, FS006, FS007, FS088, FS143, FS144	2/18/2026
Part B Assessment	FS175, FS178, FS185, FS188	1/7/2026
Part B Dispute Resolution	FS227, FS228, FS229, FS230	11/19/2025
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	FS231, FS232, FS233, FS234, FS235, FS236, FS237, FS238	11/19/2025

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data and metadata responses submitted to *EDFacts* align. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection.

Dispute Resolution

IDEA Part B

Maine

School Year: 2024-25

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	67
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	32
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	20
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	12
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines	2
(1.2) Complaints pending.	1
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	0
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	34

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	125
(2.1) Mediations held.	59
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	30
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	20
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	29
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	22
(2.2) Mediations pending.	1
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held.	65

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	51
(3.1) Resolution meetings.	3
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	0
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	2
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	2
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	0
(3.3) Due process complaints pending.	8
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	41

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.	7
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings.	1
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements.	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	2
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	0
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending.	0
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	5

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:
Maine

These data were extracted on the close date:
11/19/2025

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2026 will be posted in June 2026. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Final Determination Letter

June 18, 2026

Honorable Pender Makin
Commissioner of Education
Maine Department of Education
23 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333

Dear Commissioner Makin:

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2026 determination under Section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that Maine needs intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of Maine's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2024 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Maine's 2026 determination is based on the data reflected in its "2026 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and Entity and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) the State's or Entity's Determination

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "[How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616\(d\) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2026: Part B](#)" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2026, as it did for Part B determinations in 2015-2025. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for Maine).

In making Part B determinations in 2026, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

- (1) the participation of children with disabilities (CWD) on Statewide assessments (which include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment);
- (2) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2023-2024) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as applicable (For the 2026 determinations, OSEP is using results data on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on the NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE), and Puerto Rico. OSEP used the available NAEP data for Puerto Rico in making Puerto Rico's 2026 determination as it did for Puerto Rico's 2025 determination. OSEP used the publicly available NAEP data for the BIE that was comparable to the NAEP data available for the 50 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico; specifically OSEP did not use NAEP participation data in making the BIE's 2026 determination because the most recently administered NAEP participation data for the BIE that is publicly available is 2020, whereas the most recently administered NAEP participation data for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico that is publicly available is 2024);
- (3) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and
- (4) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of Maine's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS) SPP/APR reporting tool using your Maine-specific log-on information at <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>. When you access Maine's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in applicable Indicators 1 through 18, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that Maine is required to take. The actions that Maine is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for your State to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

Your State will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) Maine's RDA Matrix;

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

- (2) the HTDMD [link](#);
- (3) "2026 Data Rubric Part B," which shows how OSEP calculated Maine's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (4) "Dispute Resolution 2024-2025," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the Maine's "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, the Department has determined that Maine needs intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B of IDEA. The Department identifies a State or Entity as needing intervention under IDEA Part B if its RDA Percentage is less than 60%. Maine's RDA Percentage is 59.09. As explained below, the major factors contributing to Maine's 2026 Needs Intervention determination are Maine's RDA score of zero on certain results elements in addition to Maine's low level of compliance data reported under Indicator 13 for secondary transition, and timely State complaint decisions. In the 2026 Part B Results Matrix, Maine received a score of zero for certain reading and math assessment elements (related to participation on Statewide assessments) because it did not submit its IDEA Section 618 assessment data to the Department by the due date. Specifically, Maine did not report data related to the percentage of children with disabilities participating in Statewide assessments in reading and math. In the 2026 Part B Compliance Matrix, the State received a score of zero for its low performance (73.38%) reported on compliance with the secondary transition requirements in Indicator 13, and timely State complaint decisions (43.75%).

Pursuant to Section 616(d)(2)(B) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.603(b)(2), a State or Entity that is determined to be "needs intervention" or "needs substantial intervention" and does not agree with this determination, may request an opportunity to meet with the Assistant Secretary to demonstrate why the Department should change the State's or Entity's determination. To request a hearing, submit a letter to: Kelly Rogers, the Deputy Assistant Secretary and Acting Assistant Secretary for the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202 within 15 days of the date of this letter. The letter must include the basis for your request for a change in Maine's determination.

The Department is committed to transparency, accountability, strong partnerships with States and stakeholders, high expectations, and improved outcomes for children with disabilities. To support these priorities, the Secretary is considering modifications to the factors the Department uses when making determinations, effective June 2027. Potential additional factors include graduation rates and assessment data, such as graduation rates for students with disabilities compared to all students, and Statewide assessment results of students with disabilities compared to all students. Other potential factors include longstanding noncompliance (such as OSEP-identified noncompliance that remains unresolved) as a factor in determinations.

For the FFY 2025 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2027, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2025-26 IDEA Section 618 Part B data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2025 SPP/APR and the 2027 IDEA Part B Results Matrix and data submitted during correction opportunities will not be used for these purposes. The 2025-26 IDEA Section 618 Part B data will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part B SPP/APR Indicators 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 15, and 16 (as they have in the past). States and Entities are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part B data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States and Entities are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States and Entities to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in EDPass prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the business rule; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the uploaded data triggered the business rule. States and Entities will be unable to submit the IDEA Section 618 Part B data without taking one of these two actions. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part B data.

As a reminder, Maine must report annually to the public, by posting on the State educational agency's (SEA's) website, the performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in Maine on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after Maine's submission of its FFY 2024 SPP/APR. In addition, Maine must:

- (1) review LEA performance against targets in the Maine's SPP/APR;
- (2) determine if each LEA "meets the requirements" of Part B, or "needs assistance," "needs intervention," or "needs substantial intervention" in implementing Part B of the IDEA;
- (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and
- (4) inform each LEA of its determination.

Further, Maine must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the SEA's website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

- (1) includes Maine's determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State or Entity attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and
- (2) will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

OSEP appreciates Maine's efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and looks forward to working with Maine over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,



Erin McHugh
Deputy Director
Office of Special Education Programs

cc: Maine Director of Special Education