

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2023**

Maine



PART B DUE February 3, 2025

**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://mainedoenews.net/2021/01/21/administrative-letter-change-in-the-ending-age-for-special-education-eligibility-effective-immediately/> .

Evaluations and interventions of Local Education Agencies (LEAs) focus on improving infant, toddler and school-age student outcomes. The process is designed to enhance partnerships among the Maine DOE 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.

Prior to the 2022-2023 school year, LEAs were monitored on a 4-year rotation. Beginning in 2022-2023, the Monitoring Team implemented 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 would involve 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 compliance.

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 2023-24 school year unless the indicator was lag-year indicator, in which data examined were from 2022-23. 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-finding, 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/specialed/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. OSSIE continued to offer technical assistance via daily phone duty with a team member. This occurred on a rotating schedule, and each member of the team was available to respond to questions, concerns etc. from any constituent, including school staff, parents, special education directors, consultants, related service providers, community members and/or others. The monitoring team continued to implement highly individualized Technical Assistance to LEAs whose self-assessment and audit indicated this level of support. To address concerns, the team schedules quarterly onsite visits to review files and close findings on Corrective Action Plans. The LEAs work very closely with the Supervision and Monitoring team, prior to these onsite visits, and develop highly individualized and specific documents to organize the visits and make the process very efficient. Due Process 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. This is an informal process that may alleviate the need to file a formal state complaint investigation or due process hearing. Additionally, constituent communication is analyzed to assess trends across the state to fine tune technical assistance. Additionally, 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). In addition to the above technical assistance provided, specific technical assistance received and actions taken during the reporting period include the following:

The Maine fiscal team attended several virtual and in-person conferences during the past 14 months. Most notably, in-person attendance at a writing

workshop with NCSI, IDC, and CIFR in October, the CIFR conference in May, a 2-day training with NCSI, IDC, and CIFR in February, a 2-day training on audits in September, and a 2-day UGG/EDGAR training with Brustein Manasevit in October. Virtual training included Federal Fiscal Management Training, Braiding and Blending PreK Funds with CELFE, Significant Disproportionality with NDC, Finance Training for School and District Leaders 2-day training with WestEd, Cashing in on Compliance 3-part training with NCSI and CIFR. Additionally, the fiscal team attended several Community of Practice sessions throughout the year, including the Fiscal Monitoring Learning CoP, 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 fiscal monitoring policies and procedures. The team attended sessions on reallocation of funds, state set-a-side, CEIS, and proportionate share at the CIFR conference. 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. Maine provided a 2-day training on Federal Fiscal Management for the Maine DOE with a primary focus on obligation/liquidation. The 2-day training with NCSI, IDC, and CIFR provided a holistic look at written policies and procedures for the Office of Special Education. State Agency Programs: Like the Federal Monitoring Team, the Maine OSSIE State Agency Programs (SAP) team utilized WEST Ed partners: 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. I 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; followed by many work sessions to rewrite the Maine Unified Special Education Regulations (MUSER). The OSSIE Team, led by Erin Frazier, also participated in work with national partners National Alliance for Medicaid in Education (NAME) to inform Maine policy and procedures needs, to leverage more medical funding for medical services delivered in school settings, and to investigate support LEAs with a statewide mechanism for Medicaid in Education related documentation and invoicing.

State Monitoring Team: The Federal Programs Coordinator attended the following conferences in 2023-2024: NASDE, DMS Cohort 2 Convening, IDC ii24, 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. 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 and Evidence Based Practices Collaboratives and brought 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 Office of Special Services and Inclusive Education Supervision and Monitoring 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 2023-2024 school year included the following:

- Resources
 - Transition from Pre-K to Kindergarten
- Abbreviated School Day
- Discipline and Manifestation Determination
- IEP Alignment
- Orientation and Mobility
- Compliant Transition Plans
- Advanced Written Notice and Written Notice
- Present Level of Performance
- Writing Measurable Functional Goals
- Least Restrictive Environment
- Forms
- Special Education Law for General Education Teachers
- IEP Team Essentials
- Writing Related Service Goals
- Data Collection and Analysis

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: <https://www.maine.gov/doe/specialservices/professionallearning>

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 themselves. These were highly individualized and intended to meet the needs of the LEAs who requested them.

Collaboration with other specialist teams within Maine DOE continues to be a priority. The Supervision and Monitoring team has an ongoing professional development and support relationship with the Multilingual Learners Team and released the Policy and Resource Guide "Maine: Identifying and Serving Students who are Multilingual Learners with Disabilities". The link to this document is:

<https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/multilinguallearner/resources/MLdisabilities>. Maine has contracted with Multi-State Alternate Assessment: MSAA, to write, administer, score, and generative summative reports for our most vulnerable students. Members of the Supervision and Monitoring team and Assessment team work to provide technical assistance and support prior to and during the testing window, as well as professional development and tiered levels of support around specified criteria. Related information can be found here: <https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed/assessment>

Maine OSSIE 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 FFY2023 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 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.

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 2022 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 2022 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 2022 APR in 2024, 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 FFY2022 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 2023 and 2024 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2024 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 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, 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 2022 SPP/APR

In the Technical Assistance section of the Introduction, Maine has reported on the technical assistance sources from which we received assistance and the actions we took as a result of that technical assistance.

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED*Facts* 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 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%
Data	73.55%	72.94%	84.39%	83.40%	79.62%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,742
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	20
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	395

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
1,742	2,157	79.62%	90.00%	80.76%	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 ED Facts 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 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target <=	19.00%	19.00%	14.32%	14.32%	14.32%
Data	16.39%	17.91%	14.32%	16.45%	20.28%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	14.32%	14.32%	13.32%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,742
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	20
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	395

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
395	2,157	20.28%	14.32%	18.31%	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 ED Facts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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 2023 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/08/2025

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	2,968	2,562	2,527
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	2,488	2,085	2,019
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	298	208	56
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	101	87	75

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/08/2025

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	2,969	2,563	2,527
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	2,477	1,912	1,877
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	323	382	185
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	102	86	74

(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 2023 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2,887	2,968	95.97%	98.00%	97.27%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	2,380	2,562	90.85%	98.00%	92.90%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	2,150	2,527	78.61%	98.00%	85.08%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2,902	2,969	96.58%	98.00%	97.74%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	2,380	2,563	91.20%	98.00%	92.86%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	2,136	2,527	75.72%	98.00%	84.53%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

3A - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	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	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	33.11%	35.11%	37.11%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	31.73%	33.73%	35.73.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	31.00%	33.00%	35.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	27.21%	29.21%	31.21%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	11.27%	13.27%	15.27%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	20.15%	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 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 2023 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED Facts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/08/2025

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	2,786	2,293	2,075
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	822	654	602
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	78	42	10

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (ED Facts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/08/2025

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	2,800	2,294	2,062
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	609	200	209
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or	44	23	10

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 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	900	2,786	31.11%	33.11%	32.30%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	696	2,293	29.73%	31.73%	30.35%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	612	2,075	29.00%	31.00%	29.49%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	653	2,800	25.21%	27.21%	23.32%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	223	2,294	9.27%	11.27%	9.72%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	219	2,062	18.15%	20.15%	10.62%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Performance in this report, FFY2023, is the first post-baseline year with the new assessments (please see 'additional information about this indicator' in narrative box below), and it is unclear if the current percentages will fall within typical year-to-year variability or if systemic factors have influenced the decrease from baseline. This Indicator will continue to be monitored to assess typical year-to-year variability or potential systemic factors that may influence performance.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Performance in this report, FFY2023, is the first post-baseline year with the new assessments (please see 'additional information about this indicator' in narrative box below), and it is unclear if the current percentages will fall within typical year-to-year variability or if systemic factors have influenced the decrease from baseline. This Indicator will continue to be monitored to assess typical year-to-year variability or potential systemic factors that may influence performance.

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)

Descriptions of stakeholder input on the targets are discussed in the section above, titled 'Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input'. Data analysis and target-setting, including each of the Indicator 3 sections, 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. Stakeholders were aware that assessments were changing within the following 2 years and that new targets would need to be determined in the future based on new the baselines. It was agreed that, when the new baseline was set, the relationship between the baseline and targets would remain consistent with the previous targets and baseline - that is, the subsequent targets would begin 2 percentage points above the new baseline value and continue to increase 2 percentage points each of the following years. Performance in this report, FFY2023, is the first post-baseline year with the new assessments, and it is unclear if the current percentages will fall within typical year-to-year variability or if systemic factors have influenced the decrease from baseline. This Indicator will continue to be monitored to assess typical year-to-year variability or potential systemic factors that may influence performance.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using 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	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	44.20%	46.20%	48.20%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	53.13%	55.13%	57.13%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	54.15%	56.15%	58.15%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	46.91%	48.91%	50.91%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	50.05%	52.05%	54.05%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	51.00%	53.00%	55.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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 2023 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/08/2025

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	101	87	75
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	23	26	32

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/08/2025

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	102	86	74
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	29	35	39

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	23	101	27.94%	44.20%	22.77%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	26	87	33.87%	53.13%	29.89%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	32	75	55.26%	54.15%	42.67%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Across all grade levels student engagement is a challenge throughout the state such that school participation (attendance) may be impacting performance on alternate assessments. Maine is working on several initiatives to address student attendance, including Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), inclusion, building robust Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and a multidisciplinary team on student attendance.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Across all grade levels student engagement is a challenge throughout the state such that school participation (attendance) may be impacting performance on alternate assessments. Maine is working on several initiatives to address student attendance, including Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), inclusion, building robust Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and a multidisciplinary team on student attendance.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Across all grade levels student engagement is a challenge throughout the state such that school participation (attendance) may be impacting performance on alternate assessments. Maine is working on several initiatives to address student attendance, including Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), inclusion, building robust Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and a multidisciplinary team on student attendance.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	29	102	35.29%	46.91%	28.43%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	35	86	45.31%	50.05%	40.70%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	39	74	58.11%	51.00%	52.70%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Across all grade levels student engagement is a challenge throughout the state such that school participation (attendance) may be impacting performance on alternate assessments. Maine is working on several initiatives to address student attendance, including Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), inclusion, building robust Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and a multidisciplinary team on student attendance.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Across all grade levels student engagement is a challenge throughout the state such that school participation (attendance) may be impacting performance on alternate assessments. Maine is working on several initiatives to address student attendance, including Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), inclusion, building robust Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and a multidisciplinary team on student attendance.

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)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2023-2024 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2023-2024 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 2023-2024 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2023-2024 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	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	32.16	31.16	30.16
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	35.44	34.44	33.44
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	32.86	31.86	30.86
Math	A <=	Grade 4	30.82	29.82	28.82
Math	B <=	Grade 8	30.17	29.17	28.17
Math	C <=	Grade HS	23.69	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 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 2023 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED Facts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/08/2025

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	12,126	12,136	12,233
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	2,786	2,293	2,075
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	7,740	7,697	7,459
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	82	51	11
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	822	654	602
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	78	42	10

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (ED Facts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/08/2025

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	12,271	12,266	12,386

b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	2,800	2,294	2,062
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	6,642	4,742	5,268
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	49	29	12
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	609	200	209
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	44	23	10

(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 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	32.30%	64.51%	33.16	32.16	32.20	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	30.35%	63.84%	36.44	35.44	33.49	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	29.49%	61.06%	33.86	32.86	31.57	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	23.32%	54.53%	31.82	30.82	31.21	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	9.72%	38.90%	31.17	30.17	29.18	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	10.62%	42.63%	24.69	23.69	32.01	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Performance in this report, FFY2023, is the first post-baseline year with the new assessments (please see 'additional information about this indicator' in narrative box below), and it is unclear if the current percentages will fall within typical year-to-year variability or if systemic factors have influenced the decrease from baseline. This Indicator will continue to be monitored to assess typical year-to-year variability or potential systemic factors that may influence performance.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Descriptions of stakeholder input on the targets are discussed in the section above, titled 'Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input'. Data analysis and target-setting, including each of the Indicator 3 sections, 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. Stakeholders were aware that assessments were changing within the following 2 years and that new targets would need to be determined in the future based on new the baselines. It was agreed that, when the new baseline was set, the relationship between the baseline and targets would remain consistent - that is, the subsequent targets would begin 1 percentage point below the new baseline value and continue to decrease 1 percentage point each of the following years. Performance in this report, FFY2023, is the first post-baseline year with the new assessments, and it is unclear if the current percentages will fall within typical year-to-year variability or if systemic factors have influenced the decrease from baseline. This Indicator will continue to be monitored to assess typical year-to-year variability or potential systemic factors that may influence performance.

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

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 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), 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 2022-2023 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2022-2023 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2023-2024, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2022-2023 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 2022-2023 (which can be found in the FFY 2022 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.

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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	1.52%	1.52%	1.53%	1.01%	1.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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 2023 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. Although Maine believes the current methodology and thresholds have been reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring, Maine will review the current thresholds and methodology with stakeholders, including the State Advisory Panel, to gather input on whether modification is appropriate based on the most current available data.

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.

N/A

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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
2	199	1.00%	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 2023 using 2022-2023 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 2022-2023 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). Each instance of noncompliance is required to be corrected and the Maine DOE requires the district to revise their policies and procedures to comply with IDEA and Maine Unified Special Education Regulations.

The State DID 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, 2025.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2022 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. 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.

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 the LEA are maintained.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State's threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions is reasonably designed.

The State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2022 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, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

Explanation of Reasonably Designed 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. 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. Although Maine believes the current methodology and thresholds have been reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring, Maine will review the current thresholds and methodology with stakeholders, including the State Advisory Panel, to gather input on whether modification is appropriate based on the most current available data.

Maine has reported on the correction of previously identified noncompliance.

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State 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 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), 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 2022-2023 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2022-2023 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2023-2024, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2022-2023 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2022-2023 (which can be found in the FFY 2022 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.

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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2023 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. Although Maine believes the current methodology and thresholds have been reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring, Maine will review the current thresholds and methodology with stakeholders, including the State Advisory Panel, to gather input on whether modification is appropriate based on the most current available data.

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.

N/A

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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
3	3	197	0.00%	0%	1.52%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable

The reason for slippage is unclear, however, there have been anecdotal reports of overall increases in behavioral events. The state is examining data on behavioral event trends, and this Indicator will continue to be monitored to determine if the increase represents systemic issues.

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 2023 using 2022-2023 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 2022-2023 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). Each instance of noncompliance is required to be corrected and the Maine DOE requires the district to revise their policies and procedures to comply with IDEA and Maine Unified Special Education Regulations.

The State DID 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.

Correction of noncompliance was verified for 1 LEA, which included a correction of practices to align with the LEA's policies and procedures. Corrective action for 2 of the LEAs is pending and due June 1st, 2025.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2022 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. 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.

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 the LEA are maintained.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race or ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State's threshold for measuring significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions is reasonably designed.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

Explanation of Reasonably Designed 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 of a given race/ethnicity 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. Although Maine believes the current methodology and thresholds have been reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring, Maine will review the current thresholds and methodology with stakeholders, including the State Advisory Panel, to gather input on whether modification is appropriate based on the most current available data.

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A	2019	Target >=	70.00%	70.00%	56.11%	56.11%	56.33%
A	56.11%	Data	55.52%	56.11%	54.92%	55.27%	55.72%
B	2019	Target <=	9.00%	9.00%	10.78%	10.42%	10.07%
B	10.78%	Data	10.39%	10.78%	11.06%	11.22%	10.92%
C	2019	Target <=	3.10%	3.10%	3.46%	3.46%	3.46%
C	3.46%	Data	3.46%	3.46%	3.49%	3.12%	3.10%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	56.33%	56.66%	57.00%
Target B <=	9.71%	9.36%	9.00%
Target C <=	3.34%	3.22%	3.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	34,742
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	19,637
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	3,795
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	934
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	129
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	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 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	19,637	34,742	55.72%	56.33%	56.52%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten)	3,795	34,742	10.92%	9.71%	10.92%	Did not meet 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day							
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,088	34,742	3.10%	3.34%	3.13%	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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A	Target >=			39.92%	42.54%	45.15%
A	Data	46.07%	39.92%	33.45%	32.90%	35.81%
B	Target <=			24.24%	21.89%	19.54%
B	Data	23.50%	24.24%	25.91%	26.04%	24.55%
C	Target <=			0.36%	0.36%	0.36%
C	Data			0.36%	0.36%	0.13%

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	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	47.78%	50.38%	53.00%
Target B <=	17.20%	14.85%	12.50%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	0.36%	0.36%	0.30%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/31/2024

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	888	1,551	126	2,565

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	278	628	59	965
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	113	200	16	329
b2. Number of children attending separate school	128	129	15	272
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	2	1	0	3

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 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 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	965	2,565	35.81%	47.78%	37.62%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility	601	2,565	24.55%	17.20%	23.43%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Home	3	2,565	0.13%	0.36%	0.12%	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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A1	2008	Target >=	65.00%	65.00%	66.50%	66.00%	66.50%
A1	63.10%	Data	69.79%	73.05%	67.94%	64.74%	71.10%

A2	2008	Target >=	39.00%	39.00%	39.00%	39.00%	39.00%
A2	37.00%	Data	38.53%	35.55%	35.28%	37.06%	41.57%
B1	2008	Target >=	68.00%	68.00%	68.33%	68.66%	68.99%
B1	65.50%	Data	73.34%	73.12%	69.44%	65.70%	70.32%
B2	2008	Target >=	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%
B2	35.40%	Data	40.90%	38.98%	35.85%	41.70%	46.02%
C1	2008	Target >=	60.00%	60.00%	61.33%	62.66%	64.00%
C1	58.30%	Data	68.48%	71.93%	68.52%	64.51%	69.05%
C2	2008	Target >=	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%
C2	51.00%	Data	55.95%	53.74%	51.74%	54.16%	55.43%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	67.00%	67.50%	68.00%
Target A2 >=	39.00%	39.00%	39.00%
Target B1 >=	69.33%	69.66%	70.00%
Target B2 >=	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%
Target C1 >=	65.33%	66.66%	68.00%
Target C2 >=	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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 2023 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

2,189

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	8	0.37%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	448	20.47%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	824	37.64%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	536	24.49%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	373	17.04%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. Calculation: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	1,360	1,816	71.10%	67.00%	74.89%	Met target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	909	2,189	41.57%	39.00%	41.53%	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	8	0.37%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	492	22.48%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	751	34.31%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	513	23.44%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	425	19.42%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. Calculation: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	1,264	1,764	70.32%	69.33%	71.66%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	938	2,189	46.02%	37.00%	42.85%	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	11	0.50%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	389	17.77%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	662	30.24%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	389	17.77%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	738	33.71%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 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: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	1,051	1,451	69.05%	65.33%	72.43%	Met target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,127	2,189	55.43%	53.00%	51.48%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
C2	During FFY 2023 Maine Child Development Services (CDS) showed that of the children exiting we had fewer who had initially entered at a level comparable to same aged peers. This resulted in a decline in our C2 Outcomes as we had a smaller group who were able to be measured as maintaining functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.

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 2023 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2023 response rate to the FFY 2022 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%
Data	89.41%	91.89%	92.46%	87.64%	86.28%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
840	1,007	86.28%	91.00%	83.42%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The reasons for this decline are likely connected to qualitative data collected in the comments section from parents indicating that statewide staffing shortages have been a contributing factor in parents' feeling like an equal partner in the IEP teaming process. This indicator will continue to be monitored to assess longitudinal trends.

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.

14,329

Percentage of respondent parents

7.03%

Response Rate

FFY	2022	2023
Response Rate	9.42%	7.03%

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 FFY2023 was lower than the FFY2022, most likely due to the fact the different cohorts of LEAs are monitored each year. Nevertheless, 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

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

Maine has reported that FFY 2023 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Maine also reported the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services (the demographics analyzed - race/ethnicity and gender - were within 5% of the target population values).

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 2023 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2024).

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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 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 2022

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 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 2023 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2024).

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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
0	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.

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 B10 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 in specific disability categories. 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 2022

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	93.23%	92.52%	76.46%	68.18%	62.25%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
287	236	62.25%	100%	82.23%	N/A	N/A

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

51

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.

Children included in (a) but not included in (b) = 51.

Of the students included in (a) but not included in (b), 50 have completed initial evaluations, but they were not within the state-established timeline. 30 were less than 15 days late and 13 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. 1 LEA has not yet submitted evidence of completion.

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 with the 2022-2023 cohort. This follow 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 FFY2023. B11 submissions were submitted as part of a desk audit, and included the following materials:

- first 10 parental consents (initial referrals only)
- date stamped, or otherwise noted, when received in SAU
- cover page of each evaluation documented on the consent forms
- each eval date stamped, or otherwise noted, when received in SAU
- school calendars which clearly outline "student" days versus "non-student" days
- evaluation tracking tool
- eligibility forms used to determine disability category
- corresponding written notices

Once these items are received, the Supervision, Monitoring and Support team verifies all the information, and works to generate this portion of the Corrective Action Plan.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In Maine, children ages 3 through 5 are educated in two systems (Child Development Services (CDS) and Maine Department of Education (Maine DOE)). Prior to FFY2023 CDS self-monitored and reported their own data for the Part B APR B11 Indicator. However, beginning with the current FFY2023 APR, Maine Department of Education now monitors and reports on all monitored cohort data for Indicator B11 - this includes monitoring and reporting on CDS data. With DOE monitoring and reporting on CDS child find as part of the regularly-monitored cohort of LEAs, this shift constitutes a change in the baseline for this indicator, as noted above.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
25	25	0	0

FFY 2022 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) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.301(c)(1), (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance. 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 very specific 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 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 Findings by Student 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 very specific 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 school-aged child for whom consent was received, although outside of the required 45 school day timeline. Evidence for the findings of noncompliance, including paper and digital copies of evaluations and written notices, were submitted to the Maine DOE and the content was verified by members of the monitoring team ensuring all evaluations met the criteria for Indicator 11.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2021	2	2	0

FFY 2021

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) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.301(c)(1), (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance. 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 very specific 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 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 Findings by Student 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 very specific 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 school-aged child for whom consent was received, although outside of the required 45 school day timeline. Evidence for the findings of noncompliance, including paper and digital copies of evaluations and written notices, were submitted to the Maine DOE and the content was verified by members of the monitoring team ensuring all evaluations met the criteria for Indicator 11.

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the remaining two uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2021: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

Maine has reported on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022. Additionally, Maine reported that the remaining two uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 were corrected.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), 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
2005	97.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	89.72%	88.44%	69.19%	65.12%	58.13%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

Prior to considering any finding from FFY2022 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 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 67 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.

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. Reasons for continued delay include awaiting necessary evaluations to determine eligibility, staffing changes resulting in miscommunication between case managers, and evaluations being completed but not yet reviewed by the IEP team to inform the eligibility determination, develop, and implement an IEP.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2021	3	3	0

FFY 2021

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 FFY2021 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 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 the children that were identified as out of compliance have since either been withdrawn by parents, moved out of the SAU's catchment area, or have had an Individualized Education Plan implemented.

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. Reasons for continued delay include awaiting necessary evaluations to determine eligibility, staffing changes resulting in miscommunication between case managers, and evaluations being completed but not yet reviewed by the IEP team to inform the eligibility determination, develop, and implement an IEP.

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the remaining three uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2021: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

Maine has reported on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022, and the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 were also corrected.

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of 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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.08%	93.97%	36.73%	83.71%	80.77%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
154	196	80.77%	100%	78.57%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The Supervision, Monitoring and Support team recognizes that there is slippage from 80.77% compliance rate in FFY2022 to 78.57% in FFY2023. 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 also 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. All of this information 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.

Maine Unified Special Education Regulations (MUSER) outlines the General Supervision Systems. Per MUSER XIII.1, “Using data and quantitative key compliance and performance indicators to be determined by the Department, representatives of the Commissioner shall collect data and report on every SAU program at least once during the six year period of the State’s Performance Plan.”

A Results Based Accountability System began with the 2022-2023 cohort and continues to remain in place. This system places LEAs into tiered levels

1. Tier I – Meets Requirements
2. Tier II – Needs Assistance
3. Tier III – Needs Intervention
4. Tier IV – Needs Substantial Intervention

Placement into specific tiers depends on a number of factors including the following:

- Number of overall findings, including any federal indicators
- Participation in alternate assessment
- Recognition of previous CAPs being closed within the required time frame
- Any impact on FAPE, including abbreviated day, appropriate alignment between programming and identification of disability category

Each LEA is put into a monitoring rotation based on which tier they fall into, ranging from every 6 years for Tier I, to a minimum of every 2 years for Tier IV. Each tier has very prescriptive supports and follow up activities that are encouraged. For the 2023-2024 cohort, all Tier IV LEAs received quarterly onsite visits that were designed to address specific findings, for individual students based on their annual review dates. This provided special education directors very succinct and directed support for every finding and allowed them to make corrections as meetings happened and enabled them to close their CAP, while providing PD to them and their teams.

When initially introduced and implemented as part of the 2022-2023 cohort, the result of the Tiered system were as follows:

- Tier 1 – 4 SAUs
- Tier 2 – 18 SAUs
- Tier 3 – 12 SAUs
- Tier 4 – 2 SAUs

As part of the Self-Assessment, all LEAs in cohort are asked to send in two B13 “screeners”, which includes the Transition Plan of the IEP only. These screeners are reviewed for compliance and feedback is offered to the LEA. The Supervision, Monitoring and Support team maintains the screener data and uses it to support LEAs with any specific components of the indicator that might need improvement. All LEAs across the state, even those not in cohort, are encouraged to participate in statewide B13 training. This PD opportunity was offered 10/24/2023, 1/9/2024, 5/2/2024.

Postsecondary transition data were collected from the FFY2023 monitored LEAs.

The number of transition plans reviewed for this indicator is 10.

If an LEA does not have 10, the Supervision, Monitoring and Support team works with that LEA and determines an appropriate number of files for 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)

The team continues to focus on indicator B13 as a priority with the goal of reaching 100% compliance. To work towards this end, the Supervision, Monitoring and Support team continues to develop a Train the Trainer model. This model will provide the LEAs with an opportunity to have a staff member work very closely with the Supervision, Monitoring and Support team around regulatory expectations and compliance in a variety of areas, including indicator B13. This individual will be required to engage with the Supervision, Monitoring and Support team on a consistent basis, participate in specific and individualized PD and implement IDEA and MUSER regulations within their LEA. There will be ongoing support and tight communication with this individual with the eventual goal being to allow the LEA to be able to decrease the amount of support needed, based on factors determined by

the team. Another way that the team is working to increase B13 data is with the maintenance of a Results Based Accountability System that was initially implemented with the 2022-2023 cohort and is described in detail above.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
30	30	0	0

FFY 2022 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 FFY2022 corrected, Maine DOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b), (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP memo 23-01, dated July 24, 2023. To verify that each LEA was correctly implementing the requirements, Maine DOE reviewed and verified subsequent data submitted by the LEAs through corrective action reports. This data demonstrated systemic correction of noncompliance. The time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance was within one year of the identification of the noncompliance. In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 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 and submit corrected secondary transition plans developed after the finding of non-compliance.

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

LEAs with noncompliant plans reviewed during 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 Findings by Student 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 very specific 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.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 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 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 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.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Collect data by September 2024 on students who left school during 2022-2023, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2022-2023 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 2023 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2023 response rate to the FFY 2022 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A	2016	Target >=	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%
A	18.81%	Data	19.49%	23.78%	16.92%	19.23%	17.65%
B	2016	Target >=	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
B	65.68%	Data	70.04%	66.19%	64.62%	66.43%	58.33%
C	2016	Target >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
C	77.56%	Data	80.51%	76.50%	72.31%	74.13%	71.81%

FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%
Target B >=	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Target C >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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 2023 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,340
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	224
Response Rate	16.72%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	41
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	87
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)	14
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).	21

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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	41	224	17.65%	30.00%	18.30%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	128	224	58.33%	80.00%	57.14%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training	163	224	71.81%	85.00%	72.77%	Did not meet target	No 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)							

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B	Although there is an increase in higher education and the overall percentage of former students engaged in employment or education when summed across categories, the percentage of students competitively employed is slightly lower than the previous year. Analysis reveals that the decrease in competitive employment was offset by an increase in the pursuit of higher education (shown above), an increase other postsecondary education (which went from 5.6% to 6.3%), and other employment for an overall increase in engagement when summed across categories. This is encouraging, as there was slippage across all categories last year. Percentages will continue to be monitored to determine if the FFY2023 percentage and subsequent rates indicate an overall systemic decrease for competitive 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	2022	2023
Response Rate	27.46%	16.72%

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 had significantly increased in the past several years until the current year. In previous years, multiple contracted surveyors attempted at least two, sometimes three phone calls to reach potential respondents. In FFY2023, unforeseen contractor-related factors diminished the data-collection window in which responses were gathered and one surveyor was contracted. In past years, with two contractors, second and third attempts were made to reach former students in cases in which they did not answer or requested a call back. In FFY2023, the diminished data-collection window with one surveyor allowed only one attempt to reach each former student. In the years that follow, DOE will augment survey efforts with either an additional contractor or with DOE personnel 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

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

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 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/13/2024	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	1
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/13/2024	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 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	57.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%
Data	40.00%		50.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	100.00%	58.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

States are not required to establish baselines or meet 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, states will develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

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 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/13/2024	2.1 Mediations held	48
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/13/2024	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	12
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/13/2024	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	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

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	83.30%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Data	67.31%	70.21%	67.39%	79.59%	75.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
12	25	48	75.00%	85.00%	77.08%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

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, 2024). 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 2023 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2024, i.e., July 1, 2024-June 30, 2025).

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 2023 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2024, i.e., July 1, 2024–June 30, 2025) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

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

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

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

NO

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

YES

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

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

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

YES

Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

The theory of action was revised based upon stakeholder and participant feedback that led to a shift from pairs of educators engaging in Math4ME to a schoolwide approach. This shift to schoolwide will support the building of capacity in the schools across grade levels and, with the addition of the teacher of influence (TOI) in the schoolwide approach, will lead to sustainability of the Math4ME instructional practices.

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

Special Services - Math4ME Logic Model - 9.30.2024_0.pdf

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	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	19.09%	20.09%	21.09%

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Math Proficient Students with Disabilities Grades 3-8	Students with Disabilities who Tested in Math Grades 3-8	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage

2,727	15,142	18.09%	19.09%	18.01%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
-------	--------	--------	--------	--------	---------------------	-------------

Provide the data source for the FFY 2023 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)

YES

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

Math4ME Teacher of Influence (TOI) Observation Tool for Fidelity - The TOI Observation Tool documents evidence of increased coaching and support provided by TOIs around mathematical content, pedagogy, inclusion, and culture. The domains of the Observation Tool are School/Classroom Culture, Inclusionary Practices, Appropriate Mathematics Content and Use of NCTM Teaching Practices. Coaches used the following rating definitions: 1 = No evidence 2 = Some evidence 3 = Evidence 4 = Strong evidence. Baseline data were collected from 13 TOIs by the Math4ME coaches. A second round of observations will be collected prior to the end of the school year. To achieve fidelity, the average rating must be 3.00 or higher. The average 2.43, below the 3.00 fidelity threshold. Four of the 13 (31%) TOIs had an average baseline score of 3.00 or higher. Practices within the Appropriate Mathematics Content domain were observed most frequently (m=2.73), while the use of NCTM Teaching Practices were observed the least (m=2.32). The most evidence was observed for instructional opportunities for all learners (m=2.67) and mathematical routines accessed by all learners (m=2.58). More evidence was found for the use and model accurate math content and language (m=2.92) and the use and modeling of appropriate assessment tools for decision making (m=3.00). The NCTM Teaching Practices most observed were the implementation of tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving (m=2.62), eliciting and using evidence of student thinking (m=2.62), and the posing of purposeful questions (m=2.46).

In Person Training Evaluation Surveys? - Surveys were used to collect perceptions of participants who attend the in person trainings regarding the degree to which the training objectives were met, adult learning principles were used, their satisfaction with training, and the impact on their learning of the training content. Twelve administrators and 12 TOIs attended The purpose of the training was to provide a general overview of Math4ME activities, responsibilities, and expectations. A total of 24 participants responded to the evaluation survey. Overall, participants rated the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the training highly. The second and third training days were for the schoolwide teams. These survey addressed the impact of the training on participants' knowledge of the training content, confidence in their preparation to use the training content, the use of adult learning practices, and the most and least beneficial aspects of the training. A total of 64 training participants responded to the training evaluation survey. Participants rated the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the trainings highly. Respondents felt the training was useful (m=3.66), organized and clearly presented (m=3.58), and they were satisfied overall (m=3.52). Participants rated their knowledge as minimal to moderate before the training and showed growth in all content areas after the training.

Virtual Training Evaluation Surveys - There were 83 participants at the December group training. The objectives of the training were to: 1) ignite a positive math identity and beliefs around math learning and instruction; 2) create exciting classroom and school math culture and community, including family engagement; 3) gain an understanding of inclusionary practices; 4) build pedagogy, content knowledge; and 5) strengthen understanding of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) effective teaching practices. A total of 52 participants completed the evaluation survey. Overall, participants strongly agreed the Math4ME coaching sessions were helpful (m)=3.85. They agreed to strongly agreed the training was useful, high quality, and they were satisfied with the training (m=3.50 for each item).

Teacher of Influence (TOI) PLC Evaluations - In the interim of the whole school sessions the TOI PLCs were provided throughout the school year. The survey addresses the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the sessions. There were 5 TOI sessions during this reporting period. Respondents on average agreed to strongly agreed that the sessions were high-quality (m=3.46), relevant (m=3.42), and useful (m=3.41). The respondents were in most agreement regarding their satisfaction with the ongoing coaching sessions (m=3.60).

Math4ME Teacher Learning Measure - The TLM consists of eight mathematical questions and sample student answers to those questions. Math4ME participants were asked to identify which math strategy the example student was using to solve the problem. Once the participant selected a strategy, they were asked to rate their confidence in their answer. The baseline Math4ME TLM was administered to TOIs and to other participants. A second administration occurred after the reporting period. The pre/post results will be reported in the FFY2024 APR.

End of Year Participant Survey - Math4ME participants are surveyed to gather their perceptions of the quality of the Math4ME training and impact on their knowledge and capacity to implement evidence-based mathematics practices. Of the 57 participants, 50 (88%) responded to the survey. Ninety percent respondents felt their knowledge and skills had improved through their participation in Math4ME, just above the 89% average rating the year before. Special education teachers reported the largest impact on their knowledge and use of math instructional practices. Math4ME teachers and Ed Techs were surveyed to gather their perceptions on the impact of the coaching was helpful in supporting their implementation of practices and skills. Ninety percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the coaching was helpful in supporting their implementation of practices learned through Math4ME and increased their skills to implement practices learned through Math4ME. Additionally, 88% of the survey respondents felt the Math4ME coaching impacted their use of data to move students forward. Administrators felt that Math4ME improved educators' readiness to use both summative (m=100%) and formative (m=87%) data to inform instructional decisions. All respondents (100%) thought participating educators were more skilled to implement tasks to (1) promote mathematical reasoning and problem-solving, (2) promote students' use and connection of mathematical representation, and (3) help their students build their mathematical fluency from conceptual understanding. All respondents (100%) stated the Math4ME program has had a positive effect on students' mathematics learning and they would recommend Math4ME to other schools.

School Inventory - The purpose of the School Inventory Form is to determine to what degree school-wide structures are in place to support math content, pedagogy, inclusion, and culture. The Form is a school self-reflection tool and is completed by the Math4ME School Team. There are four components to the Math4ME School Inventory: Culture and Community, Inclusionary Practices, Mathematical Content, and Effective Teaching Practices. For each item within the four components, a four-point rating scale was used to identify to what degree the practices described in each component are in place (1 = No evidence, 2 = Some evidence, 3= Evidence, 4 = Strong evidence). Baseline data were collected, and the second administration will occur this spring. On average, the mathematical content practices were rated the highest (mean(m)=2.10). The average ratings for

Culture and Community (m=1.93) and Inclusionary Practices (m=1.92). Within the Culture and Community component, the classroom practices were rated the highest (m=2.00), with school-wide practices rated the lowest (m=1.75). School teams rated school-wide practices the highest (m=2.00) and classroom practices the lowest (m=1.88). School teams reported the most evidence to support their establishment of mathematics goals to focus reasoning and support productive struggle in learning mathematics (both m=2.09).

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 Special Services - Math4ME Logic Model - 9.30.2024_0.pd

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

YES

If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.

Because the the project has shifted to schoolwide implementation teams, the evaluation plan now includes a schoolwide inventory in addition to the fidelity observations, participant surveys throughout the program, and a new learning measure survey.

If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.

Due to the restructuring of the program to schoolwide from small groups of teachers, there was an addition to the evaluation plan. Most of the plan stayed the same with the addition of a school inventory to examine the Math4ME practices across the school community. In prior iterations of Math4ME there was no need to examine the schoolwide practices since the focus was on pairs or trios of educators.

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.

University of Maine Faculty

Craig Mason, Ph.D. a Professor of Education and Applied Quantitative Methods at the University of Maine provides the NWEA data analysis for Math4ME.

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. During the 2023-2024 school year, 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 strengthen Math4ME's accountability and monitoring. Strengthening the identification of the project's goals, outcomes and approaches to measurement will support system change to assist with future work to scale up Math4ME.

Professional Development

Trainers & Coaches: 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. This will support the achievement of the SiMR. 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)

YES

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

A minimal change to infrastructure is that Math4ME now has schoolwide implementation teams, including educators, administrators, and paraprofessional teams, rather than only small groups of teachers.

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. During the 2023-2024 school year, 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.

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

Through examinations of data and stakeholder engagement the Math4ME project now focuses on school wide implementation. Math4ME teams in the schools now consist of a lead teacher (called a teacher of influence – TOI) and a school wide team including an administrator, special and general educators, and paraprofessionals. State training and coaching will continue but with a focus on supporting the TOI to lead and support the schoolwide implementation. The state coaches will conduct school visits to provide individualized supports including model lessons, family math nights, assisting the TOI will schoolwide math professional learning communities, etc. The TOI and teams will build sustainability and capacity for programming in the school and will have a stronger influence on student learning outcomes and will increase inclusive opportunities for students with math IEPs.

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 mathematics 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.

Math4ME Teacher of Influence (TOI) Observation Tool for Fidelity - The TOI Observation Tool documents evidence of increased coaching and support provided by TOIs around mathematical content, pedagogy, inclusion, and culture. The domains of the Observation Tool are School/Classroom Culture, Inclusionary Practices, Appropriate Mathematics Content and Use of NCTM Teaching Practices. Coaches used the following rating definitions: 1 = No evidence 2 = Some evidence 3 = Evidence 4 = Strong evidence. Baseline data were collected from 13 TOIs by the Math4ME coaches. A second round of observations will be collected prior to the end of the school year. To achieve fidelity, the average rating must be 3.00 or higher. The average 2.43, below the 3.00 fidelity threshold. Four of the 13 (31%) TOIs had an average baseline score of 3.00 or higher. Practices within the Appropriate Mathematics Content domain were observed most frequently (m=2.73), while the use of NCTM Teaching Practices were observed the least (m=2.32). The most evidence was observed for instructional opportunities for all learners (m=2.67) and mathematical routines accessed by all learners (m=2.58). More evidence was found for the use and model accurate math content and language (m=2.92) and the use and modeling of appropriate assessment tools for decision making (m=3.00). The NCTM Teaching Practices most observed were the implementation of tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving (m=2.62), eliciting and using evidence of student thinking (m=2.62), and the posing of purposeful questions (m=2.46).

In Person Training Evaluation Surveys - Surveys were used to collect perceptions of participants who attend the in person trainings regarding the degree to which the training objectives were met, adult learning principles were used, their satisfaction with training, and the impact on their learning of the training content. Twelve administrators and 12 TOIs attended The purpose of the training was to provide a general overview of Math4ME activities, responsibilities, and expectations. A total of 24 participants responded to the evaluation survey. Overall, participants rated the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the training highly. The second and third training days were for the schoolwide teams. These survey addressed the impact of the training on participants' knowledge of the training content, confidence in their preparation to use the training content, the use of adult learning practices, and the most and least beneficial aspects of the training. A total of 64 training participants responded to the training evaluation survey. Participants rated the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the trainings highly. Respondents felt the training was useful (m=3.66), organized and clearly presented (m=3.58), and they were satisfied overall (m=3.52). Participants rated their knowledge as minimal to moderate before the training and showed growth in all content areas after the training.

Virtual Training Evaluation Surveys - There were 83 participants at the December group training. The objectives of the training were to: 1) ignite a positive math identity and beliefs around math learning and instruction; 2) create exciting classroom and school math culture and community, including family engagement; 3) gain an understanding of inclusionary practices; 4) build pedagogy, content knowledge; and 5) strengthen understanding of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics' (NCTM) effective teaching practices. A total of 52 participants completed the evaluation survey. Overall, participants strongly agreed the Math4ME coaching sessions were helpful (m)=3.85. They agreed to strongly agreed the training was useful, high quality, and they were satisfied with the training (m=3.50 for each item).

Teacher of Influence (TOI) PLC Evaluations - In the interim of the whole school sessions the TOI PLCs were provided throughout the school year. The survey addresses the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the sessions. There were 5 TOI sessions during this reporting period. Respondents on average agreed to strongly agreed that the sessions were high-quality (m=3.46), relevant (m=3.42), and useful (m=3.41). The respondents were in most agreement regarding their satisfaction with the ongoing coaching sessions (m=3.60).

Math4ME Teacher Learning Measure - The TLM consists of eight mathematical questions and sample student answers to those questions. Math4ME participants were asked to identify which math strategy the example student was using to solve the problem. Once the participant selected a strategy, they were asked to rate their confidence in their answer. The baseline Math4ME TLM was administered to TOIs and to other participants. A second administration occurred after the reporting period. The pre/post results will be reported in the 2025 APR.

End of Year Participant Survey - Math4ME participants are surveyed to gather their perceptions of the quality of the Math4ME training and impact on their knowledge and capacity to implement evidence-based mathematics practices. Of the 57 participants, 50 (88%) responded to the survey. Ninety percent respondents felt their knowledge and skills had improved through their participation in Math4ME, just above the 89% average rating the year before. Special education teachers reported the largest impact on their knowledge and use of math instructional practices. Math4ME teachers and Ed Techs were surveyed to gather their perceptions on the impact of the coaching was helpful in supporting their implementation of practices and skills. Ninety percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the coaching was helpful in supporting their implementation of practices learned through Math4ME and increased their skills to implement practices learned through Math4ME. Additionally, 88% of the survey respondents felt the Math4ME coaching impacted their use of data to move students forward. Administrators felt that Math4ME improved educators' readiness to use both summative (m=100%) and formative (m=87%) data to inform instructional decisions. All respondents (100%) thought participating educators were more skilled to implement tasks to (1) promote mathematical reasoning and problem-solving, (2) promote students' use and connection of mathematical representation, and (3) help their students build their mathematical fluency from conceptual understanding. All respondents (100%) stated the Math4ME program has had a positive effect on students' mathematics learning and they would recommend Math4ME to other schools.

School Inventory - The purpose of the School Inventory Form is to determine to what degree school-wide structures are in place to support math content, pedagogy, inclusion, and culture. The Form is a school self-reflection tool and is completed by the Math4ME School Team. There are four components to the Math4ME School Inventory: Culture and Community, Inclusionary Practices, Mathematical Content, and Effective Teaching Practices. For each item within the four components, a four-point rating scale was used to identify to what degree the practices described in each component are in place (1 = No evidence, 2 = Some evidence, 3= Evidence, 4 = Strong evidence). Baseline data were collected, and the second administration will occur this spring. On average, the mathematical content practices were rated the highest (mean(m)=2.10). The average ratings for Culture and Community (m=1.93) and Inclusionary Practices (m=1.92). Within the Culture and Community component, the classroom practices were rated the highest (m=2.00), with school-wide practices rated the lowest (m=1.75). School teams rated school-wide practices the highest (m=2.00) and classroom practices the lowest (m=1.88). School teams reported the most evidence to support their establishment of mathematics goals to focus reasoning and support productive struggle in learning mathematics (both m=2.09).

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.

Math4ME training will focus on school wide implementation teams. The training will focus on K-5 mathematics concepts and standards teaching practices aligned with the NCTM standards. Math4ME teacher coaches and teams will engage in in-person and remote learning opportunities. The Math4ME coaches and teams will then lead their schoolwide trainings with support from the Math4ME lead trainer and state coach. With other proposed infrastructure changes, this should increase retention of participants leading to a greater influence on student outcomes.

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

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

The FFY2023 SSIP report includes modifications described above such as a training focus on school-wide communities and evaluation measures such as the School Inventory and the Teacher Learning Measure. The School Inventory will be used to determine to what degree school-wide structures are in place to support math content, pedagogy, inclusion, and culture, and the Teacher Learning Measure will be used to assess pre/post training gains. Modifications will not occur until the newly modified efforts on school-wide implementation teams and new measures have been evaluated, as baseline data were collected during FFY2023. Additionally, Maine's ongoing efforts and evaluation outcomes described in the evaluation data above are positive and evidentiary of continued progress.

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.

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.

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 2023-2024 to discuss the new State Performance Plan. Meetings covered indicator content, historical data analysis, trend-analysis/data forecasting, implementation strategies, and target-setting. The Math4ME state leads meet with stakeholders quarterly to provide updates, share data, and examine questions of practice. During this year the Math4ME state team has worked to provide more opportunities for stakeholders to provide guidance in their role as an advisory panel.

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

Since the last SSIP reporting period, the Math4ME team continues to hold multiple small group meetings with both internal and external stakeholders, communicates through emails and held full stakeholder meetings quarterly to provide updates, seek guidance and make plans for the future of Math4ME. The concerns of stakeholders and the Maine DOE's plan for improvements based on this guidance are outlined in the next section of this report. Full stakeholder meetings will continue to be held quarterly for the next school year. To continue stakeholder engagement, meetings will remain online to permit stakeholders throughout Maine to attend. During the most recent meeting, the Math4ME team led participants through a variety of activities and discussions designed to showcase various components of the updated training and fidelity measures while providing a conceptual framework for stakeholders to gain their feedback and insights. Stakeholders will continue to be a critical component in providing guidance to the Maine DOE for future implementation and scale-up efforts. Math4ME evaluation reports are also shared with members of the Math4ME Advisory Panel and the State Leadership Team/State Advisory Panel. The information is used from both the training evaluation surveys to provide trainers with data-based feedback to frame their discussion on any areas of improvement needed with the Math4ME training content or delivery.

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

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Throughout the Math4ME project, scaling up and sustainability including participant retention have been concerns. To address this the program will continue to focus on school wide implementation with a school coach and team. Additionally, the Math4ME program will shift from a two year to three-year implementation with structured supports and intensive training and coaching in years 1 and 2 with a gradual release of responsibility and the strengthening of internal supports in year 3.

Additional Implementation Activities

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

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

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

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 2023 submission, use FFY 2022, July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023)
- # of findings of noncompliance the State verified were corrected no later than one year after the State's written notification of findings of noncompliance.

$$\text{Percent} = [(b) \text{ divided by } (a)] \text{ times } 100$$

States are required to complete the General Supervision Data Table within the online reporting tool.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data expressed as a percentage. OSEP assumes that the State's FFY 2023 data for this indicator is the State's baseline data unless the State provides an explanation for using other baseline data.

Targets must be 100%.

Report in Column A the total number of findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2022 (July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023) and report in Column B 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.

Starting with the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, States will be required to report on the correction of noncompliance related to compliance indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 based on findings issued in FFY 2022. Under each compliance indicator, States report on the correction of noncompliance for that specific indicator. However, in this general supervision Indicator 18, States report on both those findings as well as any additional findings that the State issued related to that compliance indicator.

In the last row of this General Supervision Data Table, 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.

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.

18 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2023	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	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 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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
1	0	1	0	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 4B due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

N/A

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. 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.

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 the LEA are maintained.

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 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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 any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 9 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

N/A

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*:

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

N/A

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 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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 any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 10 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

N/A

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*:

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

N/A

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 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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
25	3	25	3	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 11 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

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 three state complaint investigations 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*:

In dispute resolution, the sources of noncompliance are found in state complaint investigation decisions, and due process hearing decisions. If violations are found, the dispute resolution team maintains documentation of corrective action plans. The school districts send the dispute resolution office evidence demonstrating that the LEA or EIS program or provider has corrected each individual case of the previously noncompliant files, records, data files, or whatever data source was used to identify the original noncompliance (child-specific compliance), if applicable, and that the review of updated data and information did not reveal any continued noncompliance (systemic compliance). During the corrective action plan timeframe, the dispute resolution team remains in constant contact with the LEA or EIS program, to ensure all of the required documentation is sent to the dispute resolution office.

Children aged 5-22 Evaluated within the State-Established Timeline of 45 School Days: Prior to considering any finding corrected, Maine DOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.301(c)(1), (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 23-01. To verify that each LEA correctly implemented the requirements, Maine DOE reviewed and verified subsequent updated data submitted by the LEAs through corrective activities. LEAs were required to develop a plan for monitoring in the LEA to meet initial evaluation timelines. LEAs were to provide training on Child Find requirements and timelines, including the requirement to conduct an initial evaluation within 45 school days of receipt of parental consent to evaluate, and to use the LEAs timeline monitoring plan. LEAs were required to submit the following evidence: 1) outline of training, attendance at training, training plan, and 2) five parental consent to evaluate forms and evidence of date evaluation(s) received by the LEA. All findings of noncompliance were demonstrated and verified as meeting 100% compliance unless the child was no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 23-01. 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.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

The dispute resolution team maintained documentation and evidence demonstrating that the LEA or EIS program or provider has corrected each individual case of the previously noncompliant files, records, data files, or whatever data source was used to identify the original noncompliance (child-specific compliance), if applicable, and that the review of updated data and information did not reveal any continued noncompliance (systemic compliance). Each individual corrective action plan was monitored on an ongoing basis by the dispute resolution team. The team monitored via email, and phone calls and collected evidence (e.g. written notices, IEPs, evaluations, copies of staff training agendas and materials, other documentation), as required by the CAPs. Follow up emails and phone calls were made to each LEA or EIS to monitor status of the CAPs. Closure letters were sent when the LEAs completed all of the CAP requirements.

To verify that each LEA correctly implemented the requirements 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 Findings by Student 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 very specific reasons for each finding and outlines how to correct those findings.

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 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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
67	0	67	0	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 12 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

N/A

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, 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 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 67 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.

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. Reasons for continued delay include awaiting necessary evaluations to determine eligibility, staffing changes resulting in miscommunication between case managers, and evaluations being completed but not yet reviewed by the IEP team to inform the eligibility determination, develop, and implement an IEP.

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 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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
30	1	30	1	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 13 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

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 was one state complaint investigation 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:

In dispute resolution, the sources of noncompliance are found in state complaint investigation decisions, and due process hearing decisions. If violations are found, the dispute resolution team maintains documentation of corrective action plans. The school districts send the dispute resolution office evidence demonstrating that the LEA or EIS program or provider has corrected each individual case of the previously noncompliant files, records, data files, or whatever data source was used to identify the original noncompliance (child-specific compliance), if applicable, and that the review of updated data and information did not reveal any continued noncompliance (systemic compliance). During the corrective action plan timeframe, the dispute resolution team remains in constant contact with the LEA or EIS program, to ensure all of the required documentation is sent to the dispute resolution office.

Prior to considering any finding from corrected, Maine DOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b), (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, 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. This data demonstrated systemic correction of noncompliance. The time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance was within one year of the identification of the noncompliance. In addition to verifying correction, Maine DOE also complied with the requirements to: account for all instances of noncompliance identified through monitoring procedures; identify the level, location, and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any LEA with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit corrected secondary transition plans developed after the finding of non-compliance. All areas were reviewed and considered against OSEP memo 23-01.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case of noncompliance* was corrected:

The dispute resolution team maintained documentation and evidence demonstrating that the LEA or EIS program or provider has corrected each individual case of the previously noncompliant files, records, data files, or whatever data source was used to identify the original noncompliance (child-specific compliance), if applicable, and that the review of updated data and information did not reveal any continued noncompliance (systemic compliance). Each individual corrective action plan was monitored on an ongoing basis by the dispute resolution team. The team monitored via email, and phone calls and collected evidence (e.g. written notices, IEPs, evaluations, copies of staff training agendas and materials, other documentation), as required by the CAPs. Follow up emails and phone calls were made to each LEA or EIS to monitor status of the CAPs. Closure letters were sent when the LEAs completed all of the CAP requirements. LEAs with noncompliant plans reviewed during monitoring 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. All areas were reviewed and considered against OSEP memo 23-01.

Optional for FFY 2023, 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 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	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

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 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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
123	4	123	4	0

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Number of findings of Noncompliance that were timely corrected	Number of findings of Noncompliance that were identified FFY 2022	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
127	127		100%	100.00%	N/A	N/A

Percent of findings of noncompliance not corrected or not verified as corrected within one year of identification	0.00%
---	-------

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Summary of Findings of Noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 Corrected in FFY 2023 (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State identified during FFY 2022 (the period from July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023)	127
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)	127
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year	0

Subsequent Correction: Summary of All Outstanding Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022 Not Timely Corrected in FFY 2023 (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of findings of noncompliance not timely corrected	0
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	0
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	0

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.

N/A

18 - OSEP Response

18 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Erin Frazier

Title:

State Director of Special Services

Email:

erin.frazier@maine.gov

Phone:

2074462775

Submitted on:

02/03/25 2:17:29 PM