

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2022**

Maine



PART B DUE February 1, 2024

**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, the rubric "Local Determination Levels Assistance and Enforcement", and the LEA profile. The profiles provide indicator-specific data to the LEA and to the public for use in program improvement. The LEA profiles are used as the basis for determinations of LEA program performance. The indicators are evaluated for level of determination to provide the LEA with measurement-specific feedback on their implementation of IDEA.

Maine DOE's data manager works collaboratively with the federal programs coordinator for the collection of State and LEA data and performance measures, corrections of noncompliance and activities supporting LEAs improving results for children with disabilities. The CDS Deputy Director and Quality Assurance Director are responsible for the collection of CDS data and performance measures, corrections of noncompliance and activities supporting CDS sites improving results for pre-school children with disabilities. Outcomes of the SPP inform monitoring activities (e.g., child find, transition from early intervention and postsecondary transition planning).

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

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).

Schools in the State of Maine are organized into School Administrative Units (SAUs) as defined by Maine Statute, 20-A MRSA Section 1 (26). An SAU is a State-approved unit of school administration and includes only the following:

1. A municipal school unit;
2. A regional school unit formed pursuant to chapter 103-A;
3. An alternative organizational structure as approved by the commissioner and approved by the voters;
4. A school administrative district that does not provide public education for the entire span of kindergarten to grade 12 that has not reorganized as a regional school unit pursuant to Chapter 103-A;
5. A community school district that has not reorganized as a regional school unit pursuant to chapter 103- A;
6. A municipal or quasi-municipal district responsible for operating public schools that has not reorganized as a regional school unit pursuant to chapter 103-A;
7. A municipal school unit, school administrative district, community school district, regional school unit or any other quasi-municipal district responsible for operating public schools that forms a part of an alternative organizational structure approved by the commissioner; and
8. A public charter school authorized under chapter 112 by an entity other than a local school board.

Throughout this APR, the terms SAU, LEA and district will be used interchangeably.

Child Development Services (CDS) is the governmental entity that serves as an Intermediate Educational Unit (IEU) of the Maine Department of Education (Maine DOE). As described in state statute: The Maine DOE Commissioner, "shall establish and supervise the state intermediate educational unit. The state intermediate educational unit is established as a body corporate and politic and as a public instrumentality of the State for the purpose of conducting child find activities as provided in 20 United States Code, Section 1412 (a) (3) for children from birth to under 6 years of age, ensuring the provision of early intervention services for eligible children from birth to under 3 years of age and ensuring a free, appropriate public education for eligible children at least 3 years of age and under 6 years of age." MRSA 20- A §7209(3).

The General Supervision System (GSS) manages and oversees the needs of children with disabilities ages birth through 21 as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and is overseen by the federal Office of Special Education Programs.

GSS assumes the following responsibilities:

State Performance Plan (SPP): The SPP is an accountability mechanism for the State and Maine SAUs. It provides measurable indication of Maine's performance in specific statutory priority areas of IDEA. Maine Department of Education (DOE) is responsible for the SPP.

Special Education is governed by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and is defined as "specially designed instruction, at no cost to parents, to meet the unique needs of a child with a disability". In Maine, the rule chapter that is specific to the education of children with disabilities is

Maine Department of Education Regulations, Chapter 101, Maine Unified Special Education Regulation Birth to Age Twenty (MUSER).

The MUSER Summary states the following:

“SUMMARY: This rule governs the administration of the child find system for children age birth to twenty, the provision of early intervention services to eligible children birth to under age 3 (B-2) with disabilities and their families, and the provision of special education and related services to eligible children age three to twenty with disabilities and their families, implementing 20-A MRSA Chapters 301, and 303 and amendments thereto.”

An Administrative Letter outlining a change in the ending age for special education eligibility was issued January 21, 2021 and stated that Maine will implement the “federal standard” and provide FAPE to eligible students until their 22nd birthday. The administrative letter is located at the following url: <https://mainedoenews.net/2021/01/21/administrative-letter-change-in-the-ending-age-for-special-education-eligibility-effective-immediately/>

To address this change, as well as to streamline other components of MUSER, the Special Services Team at Maine DOE is working to review and rewrite MUSER. However, any amendments to MUSER have been put on pause until the next Legislative Session.

Maine DOE’s data manager works collaboratively with the federal programs coordinator for the collection of State and LEA data and performance measures, corrections of noncompliance and activities supporting LEAs improving results for children with disabilities. The CDS Deputy Director and Quality Assurance Director are responsible for the collection of CDS data and performance measures, corrections of noncompliance and activities supporting CDS sites improving results for pre-school children with disabilities. Outcomes of the SPP inform monitoring activities (e.g., child find, transition from early intervention and postsecondary transition planning).

Integrated Monitoring Activities: Monitoring activities are dedicated to improving educational results and purposeful outcomes for all children with disabilities. The Department continues to ensure districts and regional CDS sites provide programs and services for children with disabilities as described and required under federal law Section 616 of the 2004 Amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Multiple data sources and methods are used to monitor every SAU in the state. Integrated on-site and off-site monitoring activities ensure Maine’s capacity to identify and correct noncompliance and facilitate improved performance.

Policies, Procedures & Effective Implementation: The State of Maine has policies, procedures and effective implementation of practices that are aligned with and support the implementation of IDEA. The policies and procedures include descriptions of methods the State will use to detect non-compliance and ensure correction of non-compliance when found. Effective implementation of policies, procedures and practices also addresses program improvement through planning, coordination, incentives and follow-up. Policies, procedures, and effective implementation or practices, aligned with IDEA, are designed to support program improvement and focus attention on specific areas of compliance and program performance as identified through an analysis of data. Resources are available on the following webpage: <https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed>.

Effective Dispute Resolution: The timely resolution of complaints, mediations and due process actions is required for complaint dispute resolutions.

Effective Dispute Resolution addresses matters related to due process procedures such as mediations, hearings and complaint investigations. The due process team provides training for mediators and hearing officials, school personnel, agency personnel and parents. Technical assistance is available to school districts and parents. Maine’s State Complaint Investigation Reports contain findings of Maine’s Education Commissioner as to whether violations of law under IDEA and/or State special education laws or regulations have occurred. Findings of violation typically result in a corrective action plan.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, 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, from minimal assistance to substantial interventions, to improve performance. Technical assistance is implemented at varying levels and through multiple means such as websites, local, regional and/or state-wide meetings and conferences, virtual or direct training from state personnel and from other resources.

Maine DOE and CDS have several mechanisms in place to ensure high quality, evidence-based practices and support to LEAs occurs in a timely manner. Structures that exist within the Office of Special Services and CDS connect technical assistance and professional development initiatives across the Department of Education and through National TA Centers to provide collaborative technical assistance.

Targeted technical assistance: As needs arise, Maine DOE is able to direct the quality of the effective implementation of policies and procedures through targeted technical assistance. The department is informed of needs directly by districts, regional CDS sites, contracted providers, community members, families or the Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities (MADSEC). Technical assistance is then designed to meet the needs of the LEA and can take any variety of forms, including on-line resources, documents, coaching, mentoring, and training of trainers or leader teams. In addition, Maine DOE regularly communicates with LEA’s regarding current issues and offers guidance in a publication called the Maine DOE Update. Additionally, in Directors Meetings, the OSSIE Director and staff meet virtually with LEA Special Education Directors and staff bimonthly to provide timely updates and informational sessions and address special topics of interest and importance.

The Office of Special Services and Inclusive Education continued to offer consistent technical assistance via daily phone duty with a team member. This occurred on a rotating schedule, and each member of the team was available to respond to questions, concerns etc. from any constituent, including school staff, parents, special education directors, consultants, related service providers, community members and/or others. These questions and concerns were referenced and considered in the development of all professional development opportunities. The Supervision and Monitoring Team continues to enhance its data analysis to direct the technical assistance, professional development, and office hours described below.

The Supervision and Monitoring team developed an IEP Quick Reference Document (IEPQRD) directly aligning to the Electronic Monitoring Tool (EMT), which is used in the audit process. This IEPQRD outlines the expectations for compliant IEP development and will be updated and shared annually with the field. This document was shared on 9/14/2022, as part of Office Hours and with all Special Education Directors across the state, even if they were not in the current cohort for review. This document is on the Office of Special Education and Inclusive Services website and the link is included here: <https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed/pl/iep/IEPQR>

During the 2022-2023 cohort, the team worked to implement highly individualized Technical Assistance to several LEAs whose self-assessment and audit indicated this level of support. To address concerns, the team scheduled quarterly onsite visits to review files and close findings on their Corrective Action Plan. The LEAs worked very closely with the Supervision and Monitoring team, prior to these onsite visits, and developed very individualized and specific documents to organize the visits and make the process very efficient. This intervention was well received and offered very specific TA about making corrections on student specific findings, and LEA specific PD that will facilitate a positive change in practice moving forward.

The team is moving towards a more Results Based Accountability Systems approach and developed a rubric for that purpose. This rubric has 4 tiered levels that are weighted in order of impact to FAPE, determine where each LEA in the state falls and outline the tiered supports and appropriate follow-up. The rubric was shared and reviewed with the field in anticipation of its implementation with the 2022-2023 cohort. It can be found on the Office of Special Education and Inclusive Services website and the link is included here: <https://www.maine.gov/doe/sites/maine.gov.do/files/2022-11/2022-2023%20RBAS%20Rubric.pdf>

Due Process Technical Assistance: Special Services staff are 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.

The State Agency Programs (SAP) Team provided consistent TA and PD Office hours which began 2 times monthly in July 2022 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. Constituents included the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and Community Case Managers who coordinate care for the students (State Agency Clients). Technical assistance and PD helped 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 a dozen in-person targeted TA and PD to LEAs, SPPS as well as DHHS and DOC partners, based on data from monitoring and inquiries for assistance; the SAP Team provided nearly 200 hours of virtual PD and TA for all Maine SPPS.

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)

The second Wednesday of each month was dedicated to specific topics. The last Friday of each month was an open Q&A session, where the Supervision and Monitoring Team were available to respond to questions from the field.

Office Hours for the 2022-2023 school year included the following:

- Referral to Special Education: Timelines, evaluations, Eligibility Forms
- Alignment
- Academic Performance: Distinctly Measurable and Persistent Skills Gaps and How Statement
- Functional Performance: Distinctly Measurable and Persistent Skills Gaps and How Statement
- Present Level Statements
- Measurable Goals (Avoiding Outcome Goals)
- Supplementary Aids, Services, Modifications and/or Supports including Consultation
- Least Restrictive Environment
- Programming for Students with Multiple Disability: Concomitant Disabilities
- Written Notice
- Transition Assessments,
- Transition Activities and Services
- Writing Transition Plans: Beyond Compliance
- Extended Eligibility: Developing Robust Programming
- Data Series

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/learning/specialed/pl>

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
- B13 Transition Planning
- IEP Training
- Written Notice Training
- Eligibility Forms Training
- Summary of Performance Training
- How to Close Your CAP Training
- Andrew F. and It's Impact on IEP Development and FAPE
- What's Next in the Monitoring Process

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. The team created modules that look at individual components of the IEP and cover each area in depth. These modules run between 20-60 minutes and allow a deeper dive into each section of the IEP. They are recorded and available at the following link: <https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed/pl/iep>

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" in September 2022. The link to this document is:

https://www.maine.gov/doe/sites/maine.gov/doe/files/2022-11/Identifying%20and%20Serving%20Students%20who%20are%20Multilingual%20Learners%20with%20Disabilities_0.pdf

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 FFY2022 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. Through a collaborative with the University of Maine, there is a new cohort of schools who started training in FFY2022.

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.

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:

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 2021 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 2021 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 2021 APR in 2023, 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 FFY2021 APR, LEA determinations, and performance of LEAs on the SPP/APR targets are posted on the following webpage: <https://www.maine.gov/doe/learning/specialed/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 has not provided a description of the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. In its FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must provide the required information.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

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.

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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), 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 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% |
| Data | 72.46% | 73.55% | 72.94% | 84.39% | 83.40% |

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 1,684 |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 2 |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 429 |

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| 1,684 | 2,115 | 83.40% | 90.00% | 79.62% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The reasons for slippage are not clear. A change in calculation required a reset of the baseline to the FFY2021 value of 83.4%, therefore it is not clear whether the FFY2022 decline is within the range of year-to-year variability. Graduation rates will continue to be monitored longitudinally to determine if the FFY2022 decline and subsequent rates indicate a systemic decline in graduation rates.

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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), 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 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target <= | 19.00% | 19.00% | 19.00% | 14.32% | 14.32% |
| Data | 14.35% | 16.39% | 17.91% | 14.32% | 16.45% |

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 1,684 |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 2 |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 429 |

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| 429 | 2,115 | 16.45% | 14.32% | 20.28% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The dropout rate has increased from the FFY2020 baseline of 14.32% to the FFY2021 rate of 16.45% and is now at its highest in FFY2022 at 20.28%. The reasons for this increase are not clear, but the increase in dropout correlates with a decrease in the graduation rate baseline from 83.4% in FFY2021 to the FFY2022 rate of 79.62%. Analyses will be conducted to examine possible factors, such as geographic region, that may correlate with the increased dropout rate and corresponding decline in graduation rates, and these rates will continue to be monitored.

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 *EDFacts* file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

| Group | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|---|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs (2) | 2,683 | 2,623 | 2,483 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3) | 1,825 | 1,926 | 1,695 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3) | 682 | 395 | 181 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 68 | 62 | 76 |

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

| Group | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs (2) | 2,687 | 2,624 | 2,484 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3) | 1,796 | 1,785 | 1,538 |

| | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3) | 731 | 544 | 269 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 68 | 64 | 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 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Participating | Number of Children with IEPs | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A | Grade 4 | 2,575 | 2,683 | 94.88% | 98.00% | 95.97% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 2,383 | 2,623 | 89.43% | 98.00% | 90.85% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 1,952 | 2,483 | 74.42% | 98.00% | 78.61% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Participating | Number of Children with IEPs | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A | Grade 4 | 2,595 | 2,687 | 94.77% | 98.00% | 96.58% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 2,393 | 2,624 | 89.24% | 98.00% | 91.20% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 1,881 | 2,484 | 73.68% | 98.00% | 75.72% | 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>.

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 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|---------|-------|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 55.18% | 57.18% | 59.18% | 61.18% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 63.33% | 65.33% | 67.33% | 69.33% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 70.05% | 72.05% | 74.05% | 76.05% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 51.38% | 53.38% | 55.38% | 57.38% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 52.59% | 54.59% | 56.59% | 58.59% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 60.93% | 62.93% | 64.93% | 66.93% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED Facts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

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 | 2,507 | 2,321 | 1,876 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 630 | 612 | 508 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 150 | 78 | 36 |

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (ED Facts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

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 | 2,527 | 2,329 | 1,807 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 514 | 198 | 288 |

| | | | |
|---|-----|----|----|
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 123 | 18 | 40 |
|---|-----|----|----|

(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 2022 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| A | Grade 4 | 780 | 2,507 | 54.69% | 55.18% | 31.11% | N/A | N/A |
| B | Grade 8 | 690 | 2,321 | 54.79% | 63.33% | 29.73% | N/A | N/A |
| C | Grade HS | 544 | 1,876 | 55.72% | 70.05% | 29.00% | N/A | N/A |

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| A | Grade 4 | 637 | 2,527 | 49.05% | 51.38% | 25.21% | N/A | N/A |
| B | Grade 8 | 216 | 2,329 | 47.16% | 52.59% | 9.27% | N/A | N/A |
| C | Grade HS | 328 | 1,807 | 52.76% | 60.93% | 18.15% | N/A | N/A |

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Maine began using a new statewide math assessment (NWEA) in the 2020-2021 school year. 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 were delayed through FFY2021. The modifications and standardizations of scaling and benchmarking were instituted in FFY2022, and therefore FFY2022 percentages constitute new baselines. Maine will reconsider targets, with stakeholder input, based on FFY2022 baseline.

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 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|---------|-------|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 42.20% | 44.20% | 46.20% | 48.20% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 51.13% | 53.13% | 55.13% | 57.13% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 52.15% | 54.15% | 56.15% | 58.15% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 44.91% | 46.91% | 48.91% | 50.91% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 48.05% | 50.05% | 52.05% | 54.05% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 49.00% | 51.00% | 53.00% | 55.00% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

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 | 68 | 62 | 76 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 19 | 21 | 42 |

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

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 | 68 | 64 | 74 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate | 24 | 29 | 43 |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| standards scored at or above proficient | | | |
|---|--|--|--|

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A | Grade 4 | 19 | 68 | 34.57% | 42.20% | 27.94% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 21 | 62 | 28.41% | 51.13% | 33.87% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 42 | 76 | 54.79% | 52.15% | 55.26% | Met target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The proficiency rate for 4th grade reading has declined each of the 2 years since the FFY2020 baseline. The reasons for slippage are unclear given the increases seen for 8th grade and HS. It is notable that this decline was also seen for 4th grade math proficiency, but not for 8th grade or HS math. Analysis will be conducted to examine possible factors, such as geographic region, that may be related to a decline in proficiency for 4th grade, and these rates will continue to be monitored.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A | Grade 4 | 24 | 68 | 45.00% | 44.91% | 35.29% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 29 | 64 | 37.21% | 48.05% | 45.31% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 43 | 74 | 45.95% | 49.00% | 58.11% | Met target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The proficiency rate for 4th grade mathematics increased from the FFY2020 baseline to FFY2021, but declined between FFY2021 and FFY2022. The reasons for the FFY2022 are unclear, but it is notable that grade 8 and HS math proficiency both increased. It also notable that a decline can also be seen for 4th grade reading, but not 8th grade or HS reading, since the FFY2020 baseline. Analysis will be conducted to examine possible factors, such as geographic region, that may be related to a decline in proficiency for 4th grade, and these rates will continue to be monitored.

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>.

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:

- Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- 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 ED*Facts* 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 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 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 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 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 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|---------|-------|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Reading | A <= | Grade 4 | 30.35 | 29.35 | 28.35 | 27.35 |
| Reading | B <= | Grade 8 | 26.35 | 25.35 | 24.35 | 23.35 |
| Reading | C <= | Grade HS | 21.88 | 20.88 | 19.88 | 18.88 |
| Math | A <= | Grade 4 | 30.07 | 29.07 | 28.07 | 27.07 |
| Math | B <= | Grade 8 | 34.88 | 33.88 | 32.88 | 31.88 |
| Math | C <= | Grade HS | 31.33 | 30.33 | 29.33 | 28.33 |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED Facts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

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 | 11,930 | 12,357 | 11,723 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 2,507 | 2,321 | 1,876 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 7,489 | 8,092 | 7,333 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 179 | 85 | 36 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 630 | 612 | 508 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 150 | 78 | 36 |

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (ED Facts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

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 | 12,081 | 12,463 | 11,732 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 2,527 | 2,329 | 1,807 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 6,742 | 5,010 | 4,986 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 148 | 30 | 40 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 514 | 198 | 288 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 123 | 18 | 40 |

(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 2022 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| A | Grade 4 | 31.11% | 64.27% | 30.04 | 30.35 | 33.16 | N/A | Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 29.73% | 66.17% | 30.46 | 26.35 | 36.44 | N/A | Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 29.00% | 62.86% | 27.26 | 21.88 | 33.86 | N/A | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The SPP/APR application is erroneously identifying slippage. Modifications and standardizations of scaling and benchmarking were instituted in FFY2022; therefore, the FFY2022 percentages constitute new baselines, as indicated in the Historical Data section above and explained in the Additional Information section below.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

The SPP/APR application is erroneously identifying slippage. Modifications and standardizations of scaling and benchmarking were instituted in FFY2022; therefore, the FFY2022 percentages constitute new baselines, as indicated in the Historical Data section above and explained in the Additional Information section below.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

The SPP/APR application is erroneously identifying slippage. Modifications and standardizations of scaling and benchmarking were instituted in FFY2022; therefore, the FFY2022 percentages constitute new baselines, as indicated in the Historical Data section above and explained in the Additional Information section below.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|-------------|
| A | Grade 4 | 25.21% | 57.03% | 32.37 | 30.07 | 31.82 | N/A | No Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 9.27% | 40.44% | 37.02 | 34.88 | 31.17 | N/A | No Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 18.15% | 42.84% | 34.14 | 31.33 | 24.69 | N/A | No Slippage |

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Maine began using a new statewide math assessment (NWEA) in the 2020-2021 school year. 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 were delayed through FFY2021. The modifications and standardizations of scaling and benchmarking were instituted in FFY2022, and therefore FFY2022 percentages constitute new baselines. Maine will reconsider targets, with stakeholder input, based on FFY2022 baseline.

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 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 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 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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 QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

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

| FFY | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Data | 1.57% | 1.52% | 1.52% | 1.53% | 1.01% |

Targets

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target ≤ | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

67

| Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy | Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 2 | 200 | 1.01% | 0.00% | 1.00% | 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 2022 using 2021-2022 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 2021-2022 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 ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

For the LEA identified with significant discrepancies, Maine DOE reviewed specific files 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. Maine determined that LEA practices regarding Manifestation Determination were not consistent with LEA policy. Maine provided training on Manifestation Determination and reviewed subsequent data specific to these issues. All subsequent reviews were compliant.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

| 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 2021

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

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.

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 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 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 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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 QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

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

| FFY | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

67

| 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 2 | 0 | 200 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

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

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)

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

For Indicator 4B, the data were disaggregated by race/ethnicity. For LEAs exhibiting a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity in the rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days, Maine reviews specific files from each district with a compliance instrument to test compliance of each student file or policy. The purpose of this review is to ensure that districts are properly developing and implementing IEPs, use positive behavioral interventions and supports, and include procedural safeguards as outlined in 34 C.F.R. 300.170 (b). Each instance of noncompliance is required to be corrected and the Maine DOE requires the district to revise their policies and procedures to comply with IDEA and Maine Unified Special Education Regulations.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

| 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 2021

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 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 2021 SPP/APR

The following decision rules are used to determine if there is a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for children with disabilities: The LEA must have a minimum of 10 students of any race/ethnicity with IEPs enrolled. For LEAs 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.

Maine’s methodology for determining significant discrepancies by race or ethnicity 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 by race or ethnicity are occurring in the rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days.

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 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|------|----------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | 2019 | Target >= | 69.00% | 70.00% | 70.00% | 56.11% | 56.11% |
| A | 56.11% | Data | 56.41% | 55.52% | 56.11% | 54.92% | 55.27% |
| B | 2019 | Target <= | 9.00% | 9.00% | 9.00% | 10.78% | 10.42% |
| B | 10.78% | Data | 10.33% | 10.39% | 10.78% | 11.06% | 11.22% |
| C | 2019 | Target <= | 3.10% | 3.10% | 3.10% | 3.46% | 3.46% |
| C | 3.46% | Data | 3.07% | 3.46% | 3.46% | 3.49% | 3.12% |

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 33,429 |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 18,627 |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 3,650 |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools | 877 |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities | 135 |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 24 |

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

NO

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 18,627 | 33,429 | 55.27% | 56.33% | 55.72% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) | 3,650 | 33,429 | 11.22% | 10.07% | 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 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] | 1,036 | 33,429 | 3.12% | 3.46% | 3.10% | 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 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | Target >= | | | | 39.92% | 42.54% |
| A | Data | 68.32% | 46.07% | 39.92% | 33.45% | 32.90% |
| B | Target <= | | | | 24.24% | 21.89% |
| B | Data | 14.98% | 23.50% | 24.24% | 25.91% | 26.04% |
| C | Target <= | | | | 0.36% | 0.36% |
| C | Data | | | | 0.36% | 0.36% |

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 baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

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

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A >= | 45.15% | 47.78% | 50.38% | 53.00% |
| Target B <= | 19.54% | 17.20% | 14.85% | 12.50% |

Inclusive Targets – 6C

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

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

08/30/2023

| Description | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 through 5 - Total |
|------------------------------------|-----|-------|-----|---------------------|
| Total number of children with IEPs | 755 | 1,487 | 157 | 2,399 |

| 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 | 204 | 580 | 75 | 859 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 102 | 170 | 25 | 297 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school | 112 | 156 | 24 | 292 |
| 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 2022 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 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 | 859 | 2,399 | 32.90% | 45.15% | 35.81% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 589 | 2,399 | 26.04% | 19.54% | 24.55% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C. Home | 3 | 2,399 | 0.36% | 0.36% | 0.13% | 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 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|------|----------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A1 | 2008 | Target >= | 64.00% | 65.00% | 65.00% | 66.50% | 66.00% |
| A1 | 63.10% | Data | 67.54% | 69.79% | 73.05% | 67.94% | 64.74% |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A2 | 2008 | Target >= | 38.00% | 39.00% | 39.00% | 39.00% | 39.00% |
| A2 | 37.00% | Data | 40.91% | 38.53% | 35.55% | 35.28% | 37.06% |
| B1 | 2008 | Target >= | 67.00% | 68.00% | 68.00% | 68.33% | 68.66% |
| B1 | 65.50% | Data | 69.16% | 73.34% | 73.12% | 69.44% | 65.70% |
| B2 | 2008 | Target >= | 36.00% | 37.00% | 37.00% | 37.00% | 37.00% |
| B2 | 35.40% | Data | 40.46% | 40.90% | 38.98% | 35.85% | 41.70% |
| C1 | 2008 | Target >= | 59.00% | 60.00% | 60.00% | 61.33% | 62.66% |
| C1 | 58.30% | Data | 64.53% | 68.48% | 71.93% | 68.52% | 64.51% |
| C2 | 2008 | Target >= | 52.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% |
| C2 | 51.00% | Data | 55.46% | 55.95% | 53.74% | 51.74% | 54.16% |

Targets

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A1 >= | 66.50% | 67.00% | 67.50% | 68.00% |
| Target A2 >= | 39.00% | 39.00% | 39.00% | 39.00% |
| Target B1 >= | 68.99% | 69.33% | 69.66% | 70.00% |
| Target B2 >= | 37.00% | 37.00% | 37.00% | 37.00% |
| Target C1 >= | 64.00% | 65.33% | 66.66% | 68.00% |
| Target C2 >= | 53.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% | 53.00% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

2,201

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 | 0.36% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 513 | 23.31% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 765 | 34.76% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 517 | 23.49% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 398 | 18.08% |

| Outcome A | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|-----------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i> | 1,282 | 1,803 | 64.74% | 66.50% | 71.10% | Met target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i> | 915 | 2,201 | 37.06% | 39.00% | 41.57% | 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 | 7 | 0.32% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 496 | 22.54% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 685 | 31.12% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 507 | 23.03% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 506 | 22.99% |

| Outcome B | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i> | 1,192 | 1,695 | 65.70% | 68.99% | 70.32% | Met target | No Slippage |

| Outcome B | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 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> | 1,013 | 2,201 | 41.70% | 37.00% | 46.02% | 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 | 12 | 0.55% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 407 | 18.49% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 562 | 25.53% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 373 | 16.95% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 847 | 38.48% |

| Outcome C | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 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> | 935 | 1,354 | 64.51% | 64.00% | 69.05% | 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> | 1,220 | 2,201 | 54.16% | 53.00% | 55.43% | Met target | No Slippage |

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 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 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 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% |
| Data | 92.94% | 89.41% | 91.89% | 92.46% | 87.64% |

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| 1,390 | 1,611 | 87.64% | 91.00% | 86.28% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Although the FFY2022 percentage of 86.28% is only slightly lower than the FFY2021 percentage of 87.64%, there has been an overall 6% decline since FFY2020. The reasons for this decline are unclear, but data collected by parents in the comments section of the survey suggest that statewide staffing shortages may have been a contributing factor in parents' ratings of 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.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

17,099

Percentage of respondent parents

9.42%

Response Rate

| FFY | 2021 | 2022 |
|---------------|-------|-------|
| Response Rate | 8.55% | 9.42% |

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 groups were represented within 5% of the population percentages.

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 sample’s representativeness of the population of monitored districts 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 (within 5% of the population values). Maine plans to include additional demographic analyses of respondents, such as disability category, for future identification of potential nonresponse bias. When discovered, modifications may be made to the sampling method to better target underrepresented groups.

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. 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 based on analyses indicating underrepresented groups). 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. 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). The response rate in FFY2022 was higher than the FFY2021 rate . 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 and expect this added functionality to be in place for the 2023-24 cohort. The response rate and the relative percentage of parents who report that schools facilitated their involvement will continue to be monitored to assess potential nonresponse bias. When underrepresented groups are identified, analyses of non-response bias will be conducted to determine if the underrepresented groups differ significantly in their responses when compared to other groups that are represented to the extent that they exist in the population.

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

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

| FFY | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

FFY 2022 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.

71

| 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 0 | 0 | 196 | 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 2021

| 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 2021

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 2021 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 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

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

| FFY | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

FFY 2022 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.

112

| 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 0 | 0 | 155 | 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 2021

| 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 2021

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

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

| FFY | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 92.65% | 93.23% | 92.52% | 76.46% | 68.18% |

Targets

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| 1,653 | 1,029 | 68.18% | 100% | 62.25% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage

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

Child Development Services (CDS):

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received = 1,361

(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days = 759

Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who were evaluated within 60 days = $[(759 / 1,361) * 100] = 55.77\%$

The previous year's (FFY2021) percentage was 63.44%, indicating slippage for CDS.

Reason for CDS Slippage: Throughout FFY2022, Maine's 9 regional CDS sites experienced Case Management staffing shortages and a shortage of providers available to complete eligibility evaluations and write evaluation reports. Specifically, CDS found that in some instances, although the evaluations themselves were completed within the required time frame, delays in receiving reports from both contracted and CDS-employed providers resulted in delays in scheduling eligibility meetings. Additionally, in some instances, the required evaluations were completed within the required time frame, but not all, and Case Managers did not hold an eligibility meeting until all evaluations had been completed.

Maine DOE:

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received = 292

(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 45 school days = 270

Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who were evaluated within 60 days = $[(270 / 292) * 100] = 92.47\%$

The previous year's (FFY2021) percentage was 88.66%, indicating that there was no slippage for DOE.

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

624

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

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

Child Development Services (CDS):

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received = 1361

(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days = 759

Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who were evaluated within 60 days = $[(1361 / 759) * 100] = 55.77\%$

Children included in (a) but not included in (b) = 602

Reason for Delay

CDS (no delay reason was given and/or delay was caused by regional site/staff) = 334

Provider = 268

Days Beyond Timeline

61-75 = 141

Over 75 = 461

Maine DOE:

Children included in (a) but not included in (b) = 22.

Of the students included in (a) but not included in (b), 16 have completed initial evaluations, but they were not within the state-established timeline. Ten were less than 15 days late and the delays for six students range between 15 and 120 days. 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. Seven have 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. Therefore, the child find count analyses and reasons for slippage are reported separately for Maine DOE and CDS in the text boxes below.

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

State monitoring

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

Data-collection methods differ between students served under Child Development Services (CDS, which serves children ages 3-5) and school-aged students (age 5 and above).

CDS:
Early Childhood (ages 3-5) data were collected for all of the regional CDS sites. Data were collected for this indicator from the statewide database, Child Information Network Connection (CINC) and include all child records in the system over the entire reporting year.

Maine DOE:
School aged (ages 5-21) data for this indicator are monitoring data. LEAs are assigned to cohorts that are monitored on a four year rotation ensuring that each LEA is monitored once every four years. Initial evaluation data were collected from the LEAs that were monitored during FFY2022. B11 submissions include the following materials:
 - first 10 parental consents (initial referrals only)
 - date stamped, or otherwise noted, when received in SAU
 - cover page of each evaluation documented on the consent forms
 - each eval date stamped, or otherwise noted, when received in SAU
 - school calendars which clearly outline “student” days versus “non-student” days, including snow days or alternate learning day related to COVID, etc.
 - evaluation tracking tool
 - eligibility forms used to determine disability category
 - corresponding written notices

The monitoring period is selected to ensure there are at least 45 school days between the date parental consent was received and the date evaluations were completed prior to submission due date. Data collected on students whose files are randomly selected for on site review and received initial evaluation during the 2022-23 school year are identical to that submitted for desk audit; signed parental consent received by the LEA, completed evaluations and school calendar. Data are reviewed by the public school program monitoring team and checked for accuracy and inter-observer reliability.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 567 | 563 | 2 | 2 |

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Children Evaluated Within 60 Days:
Prior to considering any finding corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (achieved 100% compliance for a specific time period during the current reporting year) and 34 CFR §300.301(d) (exceptions to the timeline) based on updated data subsequently collected through the State data system; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the regional site, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). As described below, the state was not able to verify that 2 of the regional sites were implementing the requirements and had corrected individual findings of noncompliance.

School-Aged (ages 5-21): Children evaluated within the State-established timeline of 45 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 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Children evaluated Within 60 Days:
A review of data in the statewide data system showed that out of all CDS cases of non-compliance during FFY2021, all children except for 2 have since received an eligibility evaluation, although late, unless the child had moved out of jurisdiction of the regional site or exited the system. The 2 children whose eligibility had not yet been determined in FFY2021 remain without an eligibility determination due to communication challenges by case managers and shortage of professionals to complete a psychological evaluation for each.

School-Aged (ages 5-21): Children evaluated within the State-established timeline of 45 Days:
To verify that each LEA correctly implemented the requirements, Maine DOE reviewed and verified subsequent updated data submitted by the LEAs through corrective activities. LEAs were required to develop a plan for monitoring in the LEA to meet initial evaluation timelines. LEAs were to provide training on Child Find requirements and timelines, including the requirement to conduct an initial evaluation within 45 school days of receipt of parental consent to evaluate, and to use the LEAs timeline monitoring plan. LEAs were required to submit the following evidence: 1) outline of training, attendance at training, training plan, and 2) five parental consent to evaluate forms and evidence of date evaluation(s) received by the LEA. The time period within which each LEA with noncompliance was required to demonstrate 100% compliance was within one year of identification of noncompliance. All findings of noncompliance were demonstrated and verified as meeting 100% compliance within the one year of the identification of non-compliance, unless the child was no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. The monitoring team was able to verify that the evaluations were conducted for each school-aged 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.

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The CDS state office has implemented statewide monthly trainings focused on ensuring that each individual responsible for contributing to a child’s IEP is correctly implementing the requirements for timely evaluation, and has provided technical assistance through monthly program management meetings under the direction of the Assistant 619 Coordinator, with input from the CDS Data Manager. Communication between the CDS Data Manager and the 2 regional sites responsible for overseeing the 2 children for whom an evaluation has not yet been completed has occurred with the intention of ensuring that the outstanding evaluations are completed as soon as possible.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| FFY 2020 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Children Evaluated Within 60 Days:

Prior to considering any finding corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.301(c)(1) (achieved 100% compliance) and 34 CFR §§300.301(d) (exceptions to the timeline) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the regional site, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

School-Aged (ages 5-21): Children aged 5-20 Evaluated within the State-Established Timeline of 45 Days:

Prior to considering any finding corrected, Maine DOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.301(c)(1), (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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

Early Childhood (ages 3-5): Children Evaluated Within 60 Days:

CDS was able to verify that an evaluation and initial IEP meeting were conducted for each child aged 3-5 for whom consent was received, although late. Specifically, to verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from each regional site. In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, CDS State IEU also complied with the requirements to account for all instances of noncompliance identified through its database as well as on-site monitoring and other monitoring procedures; identify the level, location (regional site), and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any regional site with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit corrective action plans (CAPs). CDS State IEU and the regional site created the CAPs. These activities ranged from providing staff training, attending required TA, submitting monthly reports to the CDS State IEU and completing CAP check-in calls with the CDS State IEU.

School-Aged (ages 5-21): Children aged 5-21 Evaluated within the State-Established Timeline of 45 Days:

To verify that each LEA correctly implemented the requirements, Maine DOE reviewed and verified subsequent updated data submitted by the LEAs through corrective activities. LEAs were required to develop a plan for monitoring in the LEA to meet initial evaluation timelines. LEAs were to provide training on Child Find requirements and timelines, including the requirement to conduct an initial evaluation within 45 school days of receipt of parental consent to evaluate, and to use the LEAs timeline monitoring plan. LEAs were required to submit the following evidence: 1) outline of training, attendance at training, training plan, and 2) five parental consent to evaluate forms and evidence of date evaluation(s) received by the LEA. 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 Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. 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 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining 8 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Maine has reported on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. Additionally, Maine has reported that the remaining 8 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

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

| FFY | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 80.00% | 89.72% | 88.44% | 69.19% | 65.12% |

Targets

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

| | |
|---|-----|
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 307 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 13 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 93 |
| d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied. | 130 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | 4 |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. | 0 |

| Measure | Numerator (c) | Denominator (a-b-d-e-f) | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 93 | 160 | 65.12% | 100% | 58.13% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

A review of child-level data in the statewide database and manual verification with each of the 9 Child Development Services (CDS) regional site directors suggests that potential reasons for slippage include a shortage of case managers at regional sites, resulting in high caseloads and staff turnover combined with a shortage of professionals (including both contracted providers and those employed directly by CDS) to conduct eligibility evaluations. Additional reasons for delay include case managers canceling IEP meeting because all required parties cannot attend and canceling evaluations and/or meetings due to weather related site closures.

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

67

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

| Days beyond; | Number of Children |
|--------------|--------------------|
| 0-15 Days; | 6 |
| 16-30 Days; | 13 |
| 31-60 Days; | 10 |
| 60+ Days; | 38 |

Reasons for Delay **Number of Children**

| | |
|---------------------|----|
| CDS | 32 |
| Contracted provider | 35 |

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State monitoring

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

Data were collected by reviewing most recently available data in the statewide data system. This report includes children referred to Part B from Part C between 3/1/2022-6/30/2022, omitting children that had not yet turned 3 as of the data analysis for this indicator (and therefore, it could not be determined if an IEP would be written prior to their third birthday).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance were made based on a review of data from the statewide data system between 7/1/2021-6/30/2022, including a thorough review of the individual digital record of each child for whom correction of noncompliance could not be confirmed.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 60 | 57 | 0 | 3 |

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, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). A review of children in the data system during the reporting period showed that 57 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. 7 of the 9 regional sites were able to reach 100% compliance for a period of time throughout the reporting period based on data subsequently collected from the data system. 2 of the state's larger sites have outstanding evaluations that need to be completed from the prior fiscal year and are not able to demonstrate 100% compliance during the reporting period.

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, 3 children had not yet received an eligibility evaluation who were referred to Part B from Part C between 7/1/2021-6/30/2022. 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.

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

CDS continues to develop contracts with private providers to increase capacity to complete eligibility evaluations in order to have an IEP written and implemented by a child's third birthday when they transition from early intervention potentially into early childhood special education. The Part C early intervention program has shifted practice to refer children to Part B 619 as soon as allowable, at 2 years and 3 months, with the intention of providing additional time for Part B 619 to obtain parental consent for evaluation and facilitate evaluation completion. CDS has increased utilization of DocuSign to expedite the return of parent consent for evaluation and allow the team to proceed with identifying an available provider to conduct eligibility evaluations.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

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

| FFY | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 95.12% | 97.08% | 93.97% | 36.73% | 83.71% |

Targets

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| 126 | 156 | 83.71% | 100% | 80.77% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The Supervision, Monitoring and Support team recognized that there was slippage from 83.71% compliance rate in FFY2021 to 80.77% in FFY2022. 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 Maine Unified Special Education Regulations (MUSER) and are cited.

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 was implemented with the 2022-2023 cohort. 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 2022-2023 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.

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 10/17/2022 and 1/4/2023, and the team maintained documentation of who participated. The number of participants is recorded below:

- 10/17/2022 – 57
- 1/17/2023 – 37

Feedback was given prior to the second statewide B13 training, which gave each LEA the opportunity to participate in the PD, implement feedback and develop compliant, appropriate transition plans.

The final data for this indicator reflects direct monitoring data. Postsecondary transition data were collected from the FFY2022 monitored LEAs. The number of educational files reviewed for this indicator is based on child count, and is outlined below:

- Child Count Number of Files
- 0 – 49 2
- 50 – 199 4
- 200 – 399 6
- 400 – 750 8
- More than 750 10

| 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 has highlighted indicator B13 as a priority with the goal of reaching 100% compliance. To work towards this end, the Supervision, Monitoring and Support team is developing a Train the Trainer model. This model will provide the LEAs with an opportunity to have a staff member work very closely with the 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 development of a Results Based Accountability System that was implemented with the 2022-2023 cohort. 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 2022-2023 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.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 29 | 28 | 1 | 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, Maine DOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b), (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. To verify that each LEA was correctly implementing the requirements, Maine DOE reviewed and verified subsequent data submitted by the LEAs through corrective action reports. This data demonstrated systemic correction of noncompliance. The time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance was within one year of the identification of the noncompliance. In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, Maine DOE also complied with the requirements to: account for all instances of noncompliance identified through monitoring procedures; identify the level, location, and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any LEA with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit corrected secondary transition plans developed after the finding of non-compliance.

All areas were reviewed and considered against OSEP memo 09-02. Moving forward, the team will consider and implement the guidance from OSEP memo 23-01.

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

LEAs with noncompliant plans reviewed during monitoring received a finding for post-secondary transition plans on their Corrective Action Plan (CAP). 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 09-02. Moving forward, the team will consider and implement the guidance from OSEP memo 23-01.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| FFY 2020 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

FFY 2020

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 FFY2020 corrected, Maine DOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b), (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data subsequently collected through corrective activities; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. To verify that each LEA was correctly implementing the requirements, Maine DOE reviewed and verified subsequent data submitted by the LEAs through corrective action reports. This data demonstrated systemic correction of noncompliance. The time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance was within one year of the identification of the noncompliance. In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, Maine DOE also complied with the requirements to: account for all instances of noncompliance identified through monitoring procedures; identify the level, location, and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any LEA with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit corrected secondary transition plans developed after the finding of non-compliance.

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

LEAs with noncompliant plans reviewed during monitoring received a finding for post-secondary transition plans on their Corrective Action Plan (CAP). 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.

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 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, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 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 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 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 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|---------|----------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | 2016 | Target >= | 27.00% | 30.00% | 30.00% | 30.00% | 30.00% |
| A | 18.81% | Data | 17.27% | 19.49% | 23.78% | 16.92% | 19.23% |
| B | 2016 | Target >= | 79.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% |
| B | 65.68% | Data | 71.21% | 70.04% | 66.19% | 64.62% | 66.43% |
| C | 2016 | Target >= | 84.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% |
| C | 77.56% | Data | 80.91% | 80.51% | 76.50% | 72.31% | 74.13% |

FFY 2021 Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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 2022 SPP/APR Data

| | |
|--|--------|
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 1,486 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 408 |
| Response Rate | 27.46% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 72 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 166 |
| 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) | 23 |
| 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). | 32 |

| 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|----------------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 72 | 408 | 19.23% | 30.00% | 17.65% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 238 | 408 | 66.43% | 80.00% | 58.33% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training | 293 | 408 | 74.13% | 85.00% | 71.81% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

| Measure | Number of respondent youth | Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|----------------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4) | | | | | | | |

| Part | Reasons for slippage, if applicable |
|------|---|
| A | The reasons for slippage are not clear, although the FFY2022 is within the range of recent year-to-year variability. Percentages will continue to be monitored longitudinally to determine if the FFY2022 percentage and subsequent rates indicate an overall systemic decrease for enrollment in higher education. |
| B | The rate of competitive employment significantly decreased from FFY2021 (47.2%) to FFY2022 (40.7%), which significantly affected the Part B rate (higher ed plus competitive employment). Looking longitudinally, the overall decrease in Part B does not appear to be solely due to a longitudinal decrease in the higher ed rate or solely due to a longitudinal decrease in the competitive employment rate. However, FFY2022 marks the lowest rate for competitive employment in several years. Analysis will be conducted to examine possible factors, such as geographic region, that may be related to a decline in competitive employment, and these rates will continue to be monitored. |
| C | The reasons for slippage are not clear. Although the FFY2022 rate for Part C is within the range of recent year-to-year variability, the FFY2022 rate appears to have been affected most by a decline in the rate of competitive employment. Percentages will continue to be monitored longitudinally to determine if the FFY2022 percentage and subsequent rates indicate an overall systemic decrease for category C. Additionally analysis will be conducted to examine possible factors, such as geographic region, that may be related to a decline in 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 | 2021 | 2022 |
|---------------|--------|--------|
| Response Rate | 21.78% | 27.46% |

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

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

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

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

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

YES

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

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

Maine's response rate has significantly increased in the past several years - Maine's FFY2022 was significantly greater than that of FFY2021, which was greater than the FFY2020 response rate. Maine will seek continuous improvement to survey response rates. Surveyors attempt at least two phone calls for each non-respondent. However, post-school contact information for students is not always accurate/up to date, phone numbers change, etc. Maine

will 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. 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 to promote respondent representation across a broad cross section of exiters. Representativeness analyses indicated that respondents were represented at least to the extent that they existed in the population or were within 5% of the population percentages of exiters. When underrepresented groups are identified, Maine will make additional efforts (e.g., additional phone call attempts) to reach representatives of these groups. Additionally, 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 |

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 baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|---|------------|--|------|
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/15/2023 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 1 |
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/15/2023 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 1 |

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| Target >= | 58.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% | 58.00% |
| Data | 14.29% | 40.00% | | 50.00% | 100.00% |

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

| 3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 3.1 Number of resolutions sessions | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 1 | 1 | 100.00% | 58.00% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

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 baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, 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 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/15/2023 | 2.1 Mediations held | 56 |
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/15/2023 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 19 |
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/15/2023 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 23 |

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 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% |
| Data | 69.09% | 67.31% | 70.21% | 67.39% | 79.59% |

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|--|-------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| 19 | 23 | 56 | 79.59% | 85.00% | 75.00% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The reason for slippage is unclear, however, the FFY2022 value of 75% is within the typical range of year-to-year variability, having increased from 67.39% in FFY2020 to 79.59% in FFY2021. The rate of mediations will continue to be monitored to determine if a year-to-year trend of slippage exists.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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, 2023). 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 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

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 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

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

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

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

NO

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

YES

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

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

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

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

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

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 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | Data must be greater than or equal to the target | 49.83% | 51.83% | 53.83% | 55.83% |

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

| Math Proficient Students with Disabilities Grades 3-8 | Students with Disabilities who Tested in Math Grades 3-8 | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| 2,666 | 14,740 | 46.49% | 49.83% | 18.09% | N/A | N/A |

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 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 were delayed through FFY2021. The modifications and standardizations of scaling and benchmarking were instituted in FFY2022, and therefore FFY2022 percentages constitute new baselines. Maine will reconsider targets, with stakeholder input, based on FFY2022 baseline.

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

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

Additional data assessed by the external evaluators are described below:

2022-23 Classroom Observations:

All teachers were provided an interview tool (the Math Fluency Interview Tools & Trajectory (mFITT)) and training to implement it. Each teacher was encouraged to be observed by a coach and receive feedback on the administration of the mFITT interview once during the fall semester and again during the spring semester. Once the second interview was complete, the coach would provide feedback to the instructor. The coaches scored the educators on their fidelity of use of the mFITT interview tool, their questioning strategies and their use of data to inform instruction. Possible scores ranged from 0, "no evidence" to 4, "strong evidence". There were seven NCTM practice areas that were evaluated. The quantitative data from the observations were analyzed investigate areas of strength and weakness, focusing on average score results. One third of participants (19) completed all parts of both observations. However, most educators (82%, n=47) submitted a portion of the observation. The practice that saw a meaningful increase was the educator asking the student questions on targeted items. There was an increase in the percentage of students showing growth in their mathematics from fall to spring. However, the observation data provided to the evaluators was missing requested items on most observations. The 19 educators who completed all parts of both interviews showed a slight increase in the average score from 2.5 (some evidence, evidence) to 2.7 (some evidence, evidence). In reviewing the data, three educators (16%) were observed to be practicing at the evidence level in the first observation. This increased to ten (53%) who were at the evidence level in the spring observation.

2022-23 End of Year/Post-training Teacher Survey:

Perceptions of coaching supports, trainings, and implementation practices were investigated through surveys conducted near the end of the school year. Fifty teachers and Educational Technicians responded to the survey, for an overall response rate of 88%. Most educators (90%, n=45) felt their mathematical instruction practice had improved since beginning the Math4ME program. The most common change in instructional practice was the addition of Math4ME games and activities (90%, n=45). More than half said they changed their questioning strategy (62%, n=31), allowed students more time to think (60%, n=30), and increased their focus on fluency (54%, n=27). Teachers and Ed Techs differed in what they considered the greatest challenge to implementing the math practices that they learned about in Math4ME. Teachers most commonly felt the greatest challenge was time. Ed Techs most often identified student attendance (60%, n=9). All special education teachers (n=14), 85% of regular education teachers (n=18) and 80% of Ed Techs (n=12) agreed that Math4ME improved their knowledge and understanding of math instructional practices. The majority of educators felt Math4ME increased their preparation to help students use and connect mathematical representations (86%, n=43), to build procedural fluency from conceptual understanding (88%, n=44), and to implement instructional tasks to promote students' reasoning and problem-solving skills (88%, n=44). Educators also felt Math4ME increased their preparation to use a variety of instructional strategies to help students who struggle in math (88%, n=44). Most educators (84%, n=41) felt their knowledge and understanding of the fluency interview tool, mFITT, was improved by the Math4ME professional development, and their confidence in using the fact fluency tool also increased (86%, n=43). Most educators (90%, n=45) agreed their coach helped improve their knowledge of Math4ME instructional practices. The coaches helped educators (90%, n=45) feel more prepared to implement the Math4ME instructional practices. When asked about the most useful aspect of the coaching they received, participants had a variety of answers. They appreciated the support coaches provided. They felt they learned how to better question students, and let students talk more. Coaches provided resources, different approaches and guidance on how to move students forward. Most teachers and Ed Techs agreed that their participation in Math4ME (92%, n=46) and their use of the Math4ME instructional practices (96%, n=48) had a positive impact on their students' mathematics learning.

2022-23 Administrator Survey:

An online survey was sent in near the end of the school year to the 13 administrators who participated in Math4ME during the 2022-23 school year. The two teaching principals were sent this survey. The survey contained open-ended and fixed-choice items that asked the educators to give their perspective on the Math4ME program. The response rate was 62% with eight administrators responding. Five of the respondents (63%) were principals, teaching principals or assistant principals. Two (25%) were special education directors or assistant directors. One was a superintendent. All eight administrators felt Math4ME training was useful to participating educators. Five (63%) strongly agreed with the statement and three (38%) somewhat agreed with the statement. All agreed the Math4ME program improved educators' ability to help their students build their mathematical fluency from conceptual understanding (5 strongly agreed, 3 somewhat agreed) and improved educators' ability to promote students' use and connection of mathematical representation (7 strongly agreed, 1 somewhat agreed). All eight administrators agreed (5 strongly agreed, 3 somewhat agreed) that Math4ME improved educators' ability to implement tasks to promote students' mathematical reasoning and problem-solving. In open-ended answers, administrators noted that the staff was more confident in teaching math. Others noted teachers were talking about the practices, including math interviews, and focusing on the process and foundational skills that they had learned. Most administrators (5 strongly agreed, 2 somewhat agreed) agreed that the Math4ME PLCs and group sessions were useful to educators. Seven of the administrators (88%) agreed that their schools' participation in the Math4ME program has had a positive effect on students' mathematics learning (2 strongly agree, 5 somewhat agreed). All eight administrators would recommend the Math4ME program to other schools (4 strongly agree, 4 somewhat agree).

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

YES

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

The previous Maine statewide math assessment has not shown improvement in student learning. Maine DOE discussed potential contributing factors for this finding with stakeholders. One potential factor that was discussed is the fact that one of the analyses consists of a within-school proficiency comparisons of Math4ME classes and classes with the teachers not in Math4ME. Surveys show that coaches and teachers are reporting that they are sharing the resources with teachers that are not in Math4ME. In this case, proficiency may not differ substantially when comparing students taught by Math4ME teachers and those not taught by Math4ME teachers. An additional potential factor is that the Maine statewide math assessment that has been used is administered at grade placement level. It has been found, however, that the average percentage of special education teachers' students who are one or more mathematics grade levels below grade placement is very high. Therefore, the Maine statewide math assessment that has been used may not be a sensitive instrument for showing improvement for students at lower learning levels (below grade level). Based on discussions with stakeholders, the decision was made that the assessment is changed to the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP), which is adaptive and tests students near their learning level. Additionally, the Math4ME team has consulted with MEPRI to evaluate the more detailed NWEA math subtests that are available to maximize the sensitivity and specificity of the instruments used to evaluate student learning. It is expected that results of the analysis of these subtests will be available in FFY2023.

Additionally, classroom observations were frequently not completed in their entirety. Participation and engagement issues may have played a role, as a number of participants disengaged from the program during FFY2022. In FFY2023, Math4ME has engaged entire schools for the first time in the history of the program. 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 National Council of Teachers of Mathematics standards. Math4ME teacher coaches and teams will engage in in-person and remote learning opportunities. The Math4ME coaches and teams will then lead their school Learning Communities with support from the Math4ME lead trainer and state coach. These modifications are likely to increase engagement and retention of participants and result in a greater influence on student outcomes.

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

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

https://www.maine.gov/doe/sites/maine.gov.do/files/inline-files/Outcomes%2C%20Measures%20and%20Evaluation%20Plan%202021.xlsx_3.pdf

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

NO

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

Maine Education Policy Research Institute (MEPRI)

Maine DOE maintains its contract with MEPRI to serve as the external evaluator of the SSIP. MEPRI is a University of Maine research center with two decades of experience providing research, program evaluation, and policy analysis to Maine schools, government and community agencies, and the Maine State Legislature. Based on this long relationship, MEPRI personnel have detailed knowledge of Maine's educational data and initiatives. The SSIP evaluation continues to be coordinated by Janet Fairman, Ph.D., an Associate Research Professor of Education at the University of Maine, and Craig Mason, Ph.D. a Professor of Education and Applied Quantitative Methods at the University of Maine. In the next reporting period the Maine DOE will continue to work with Dr. Mason.

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. In the next reporting period Garrett Consulting will be taking on additional external evaluation responsibilities.

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 is shifting to a statewide initiative. The Maine DOE Math Inclusion Specialist, has transitioned to serve 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 the distinguished educator supporting Math4ME with training and coaching. She 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 Teachers

In this reporting period Math4ME focused on rural special educators and the paraprofessionals that work with them and general educators in a team. This year started with educator and paraprofessional pairs in the most rural areas of Maine. The participating Local Education Agencies (LEAs) were selected based on an application process that assessed readiness and capacity to institute evidence-based improvement practices in teaching mathematics. During the current school year 2023-2024, the Math4ME project has shifted to a school-wide approach with teams of administrators, educators (general and special) and paraprofessionals are engaging in the work and then implementing the practices with all 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 new 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 General & Special Education Teachers & Paraprofessionals: By focusing on educator and paraprofessional teams, students will be exposed to research-based teaching practices in fundamental concepts in math consistently. This will support the achievement of the SiMR. The teams' understanding of math best practices will increase proficiency in math for students with disabilities in their classrooms. During the current school year, these teams have been expanded to include a teacher of influence (coach), an administrator, special educator, general educators and paraprofessionals.

Governance

Advisory Group: The continued guidance and accountability by the stakeholder group will support sustainability. Additionally, the leadership from the state advisory panel will support the building of capacity and sustainability of the work.

Technical Assistance

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

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

NO

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

Through examinations of data and stakeholder engagement the Math4ME project will focus on school wide implementation for the 2023-2024 school year. Math4ME teams in the schools will 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), and Coaching.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

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 teachers of grades 3-8 special education students in the fundamental concepts in math content and pedagogy with a focus on the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) principles and standards. Math4ME trainers/coaches also provide analysis of formative assessment results with teachers, methods of evaluating students for math levels to report strengths and needs, and other supports as requested by the teacher. Numerous resources relevant to math content and pedagogy may be found on the Math4ME Padlet website, including learning trajectory resources, formative assessment tools, and full research articles on evidence-based teaching practices.

Professional Learning Communities (PLC)

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

Coaching

Participants engaged in observation cycles with one of the Math4ME coaches. In addition to coaching, participants are supported with ad-hoc assistance from the Lead Coach and LEA-Level Coaches and are provided with numerous technical assistance resources. Coaches provide opportunities for

conversations about mathematic instructional practices and informal observations with feedback. The Math4ME padlet also contains preconference coaching tools, coaching visit overview, and other materials used by the Coaches and Math4ME teachers for the coaching visits. The continued practice of developing teachers' conceptual understanding of mathematics and mathematics instruction through professional learning and coaching will lead to a change in classroom practices. The teachers' advanced mathematical understanding and pedagogy will lead to gains in student learning.

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

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

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

Data assessed by the external evaluators are described below:

2022-23 Classroom Observations:

All teachers were provided an interview tool (the Math Fluency Interview Tools & Trajectory (mFITT)) and training to implement it. Each teacher was encouraged to be observed by a coach and receive feedback on the administration of the mFITT interview once during the fall semester and again during the spring semester. Once the second interview was complete, the coach would provide feedback to the instructor. The coaches scored the educators on their fidelity of use of the mFITT interview tool, their questioning strategies and their use of data to inform instruction. Possible scores ranged from 0, "no evidence" to 4, "strong evidence". There were seven NCTM practice areas that were evaluated. The quantitative data from the observations were analyzed investigate areas of strength and weakness, focusing on average score results. One third of participants (19) completed all parts of both observations. However, most educators (82%, n=47) submitted a portion of the observation. The practice that saw a meaningful increase was the educator asking the student questions on targeted items. There was an increase in the percentage of students showing growth in their mathematics from fall to spring. However, the observation data provided to the evaluators was missing requested items on most observations. The 19 educators who completed all parts of both interviews showed a slight increase in the average score from 2.5 (some evidence, evidence) to 2.7 (some evidence, evidence). In reviewing the data, three educators (16%) were observed to be practicing at the evidence level in the first observation. This increased to ten (53%) who were at the evidence level in the spring observation.

2022-23 End of Year/Post-training Teacher Survey:

Perceptions of coaching supports, trainings, and implementation practices were investigated through surveys conducted near the end of the school year. Fifty teachers and Educational Technicians responded to the survey, for an overall response rate of 88%. Most educators (90%, n=45) felt their mathematical instruction practice had improved since beginning the Math4ME program. The most common change in instructional practice was the addition of Math4ME games and activities (90%, n=45). More than half said they changed their questioning strategy (62%, n=31), allowed students more time to think (60%, n=30), and increased their focus on fluency (54%, n=27). Teachers and Ed Techs differed in what they considered the greatest challenge to implementing the math practices that they learned about in Math4ME. Teachers most commonly felt the greatest challenge was time. Ed Techs most often identified student attendance (60%, n=9). All special education teachers (n=14), 85% of regular education teachers (n=18) and 80% of Ed Techs (n=12) agreed that Math4ME improved their knowledge and understanding of math instructional practices. The majority of educators felt Math4ME increased their preparation to help students use and connect mathematical representations (86%, n=43), to build procedural fluency from conceptual understanding (88%, n=44), and to implement instructional tasks to promote students' reasoning and problem-solving skills (88%, n=44). Educators also felt Math4ME increased their preparation to use a variety of instructional strategies to help students who struggle in math (88%, n=44). Most educators (84%, n=41) felt their knowledge and understanding of the fluency interview tool, mFITT, was improved by the Math4ME professional development, and their confidence in using the fact fluency tool also increased (86%, n=43). Most educators (90%, n=45) agreed their coach helped improve their knowledge of Math4ME instructional practices. The coaches helped educators (90%, n=45) feel more prepared to implement the Math4ME instructional practices. When asked about the most useful aspect of the coaching they received, participants had a variety of answers. They appreciated the support coaches provided. They felt they learned how to better question students, and let students talk more. Coaches provided resources, different approaches and guidance on how to move students forward. Most teachers and Ed Techs agreed that their participation in Math4ME (92%, n=46) and their use of the Math4ME instructional practices (96%, n=48) had a positive impact on their students' mathematics learning.

2022-23 Administrator Survey:

An online survey was sent in near the end of the school year to the 13 administrators who participated in Math4ME during the 2022-23 school year. The two teaching principals were sent this survey. The survey contained open-ended and fixed-choice items that asked the educators to give their perspective on the Math4ME program. The response rate was 62% with eight administrators responding. Five of the respondents (63%) were principals, teaching principals or assistant principals. Two (25%) were special education directors or assistant directors. One was a superintendent. All eight administrators felt Math4ME training was useful to participating educators. Five (63%) strongly agreed with the statement and three (38%) somewhat agreed with the statement. All agreed the Math4ME program improved educators' ability to help their students build their mathematical fluency from conceptual understanding (5 strongly agreed, 3 somewhat agreed) and improved educators' ability to promote students' use and connection of mathematical representation (7 strongly agreed, 1 somewhat agreed). All eight administrators agreed (5 strongly agreed, 3 somewhat agreed) that Math4ME improved educators' ability to implement tasks to promote students' mathematical reasoning and problem-solving. In open-ended answers, administrators noted that the staff was more confident in teaching math. Others noted teachers were talking about the practices, including math interviews, and focusing on the process and foundational skills that they had learned. Most administrators (5 strongly agreed, 2 somewhat agreed) agreed that the Math4ME PLCs and group sessions were useful to educators. Seven of the administrators (88%) agreed that their schools' participation in the Math4ME program has had a positive effect on students' mathematics learning (2 strongly agree, 5 somewhat agreed). All eight administrators would recommend the Math4ME program to other schools (4 strongly agree, 4 somewhat agree).

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 practices 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 school PLCs 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)

NO

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

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 school PLCs 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. The plan for the 2023-2024 school year is to refine the program 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.

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 2021-2022 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.

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.

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. The plan for the 2023-2024 school year is to refine the program 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

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 Birth to 22

Email:

erin.frazier@maine.gov

Phone:

2074462775

Submitted on:

02/01/24 2:48:36 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

| Percentage (%) | Determination |
|----------------|---------------|
| | |

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

| | Total Points Available | Points Earned | Score (%) |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| Results | | | |
| Compliance | | | |

2024 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

| Reading Assessment Elements | Performance (%) | Score |
|---|-----------------|-------|
| Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments | | |
| Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments | | |
| Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress | | |
| Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress | | |
| Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress | | |
| Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress | | |

Math Assessment Elements

| Math Assessment Elements | Performance (%) | Score |
|---|-----------------|-------|
| Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments | | |
| Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments | | |
| Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress | | |
| Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress | | |
| Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress | | |
| Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress | | |

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2024: Part B."

Exiting Data Elements

| Exiting Data Elements | Performance (%) | Score |
|---|-----------------|-------|
| Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out | | |
| Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma** | | |

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

| Part B Compliance Indicator (2) | Performance (%) | Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (3) | Score |
|--|-----------------|---|-------|
| Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements. | | | |
| Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification. | | | |
| Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification. | | | |
| Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation | | | |
| Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday | | | |
| Indicator 13: Secondary transition | | | |
| Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data | | | |
| Timely State Complaint Decisions | | | |
| Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions | | | |
| Longstanding Noncompliance | | | |
| Specific Conditions | | | |
| Uncorrected identified noncompliance | | | |

(2) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

(3) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are $\geq 5\%$ and $< 10\%$ for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and $\geq 90\%$ and $< 95\%$ for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

Data Rubric

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

| APR Indicator | Valid and Reliable | Total |
|---------------|--------------------|-------|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3A | | |
| 3B | | |
| 3C | | |
| 3D | | |
| 4A | | |
| 4B | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |

APR Score Calculation

| | |
|---|--|
| Subtotal | |
| Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right. | |
| Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) = | |

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

| Table | Timely | Complete Data | Passed Edit Check | Total |
|--|--------|---------------|-------------------|-------|
| Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23 | | | | |
| Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24 | | | | |
| Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24 | | | | |
| Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24 | | | | |
| State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24 | | | | |
| Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23 | | | | |
| MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23 | | | | |

618 Score Calculation

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Subtotal | |
| Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) = | |

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

| | |
|--|--|
| A. APR Grand Total | |
| B. 618 Grand Total | |
| C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) = | |
| Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator | |
| Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator | |
| Denominator | |
| D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) = | |
| E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) = | |

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files or the entire *EMAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

| 618 Data Collection | EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey | Due Date |
|---|---|------------|
| Part B Child Count and Educational Environments | C002 & C089 | 8/30/2023 |
| Part B Personnel | C070, C099, C112 | 2/21/2024 |
| Part B Exiting | C009 | 2/21/2024 |
| Part B Discipline | C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144 | 2/21/2024 |
| Part B Assessment | C175, C178, C185, C188 | 1/10/2024 |
| Part B Dispute Resolution | Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS | 11/15/2023 |
| Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services | Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS | 5/3/2023 |

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to *EDFacts* aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in EMAPS. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>