

Maine Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

While the State has publicly reported on the performance of each local education agency (LEA) located in the State on the targets in the State’s performance plan as required by IDEA section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(1), those reports do not contain all required information. Specifically, the State did not include the following in their public reports: (1) graduation data for the 2005-2006 school year (Indicator 1); (2) an indication of the significant discrepancy (yes/no) for Indicator 4A; and (3) a target column for Indicator 12.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 77%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 74.3%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 78%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, complete FFY 2005 progress data and FFY 2006 progress data, including data from all districts. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 3.5%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 3.7%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 4.0%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, complete FFY 2005 progress data and FFY 2006 progress data, including data from all districts. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 93.8% for reading and 92.7% for math. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2005 data of 98.9% for reading and 97.8% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets of 97.5% for reading or 99% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, progress data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, including results for all students in the grades assessed, and the percent of districts meeting AYP for the disability subgroup. The State provided the required information.</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																			
[Results Indicator]		OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.																																			
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 97.4% for reading and 96.8% for math. Although the State reported FFY 2006 participation data overall for reading and for math, the State's targets for participation are stated separately by grades 4, 8, and 11.</p> <p>For FFY 2006, these data represent progress for 4th and 11th grade math, and slippage for 11th grade reading.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 targets for 4th and 11th grade math, and for 4th grade reading. The State did not meet its other FFY 2006 targets for this indicator.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 829 1419 1114"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>99%</td> <td>98.8%</td> <td>98%</td> <td>98%</td> <td>98.8%</td> <td>98%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>99%</td> <td>96.6%</td> <td>98%</td> <td>98%</td> <td>96.6%</td> <td>98%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11</td> <td>87.9%</td> <td>87.1%</td> <td>92%</td> <td>87.9%</td> <td>92.3%</td> <td>92%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target		Reading			Math			4	99%	98.8%	98%	98%	98.8%	98%	8	99%	96.6%	98%	98%	96.6%	98%	11	87.9%	87.1%	92%	87.9%	92.3%	92%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target																															
	Reading			Math																																	
4	99%	98.8%	98%	98%	98.8%	98%																															
8	99%	96.6%	98%	98%	96.6%	98%																															
11	87.9%	87.1%	92%	87.9%	92.3%	92%																															
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1295 1419 1494"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>32%</td> <td>37%</td> <td>41%</td> <td>34%</td> <td>27%</td> <td>21%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target		Reading			Math			4	32%	37%	41%	34%	27%	21%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>														
Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target																															
	Reading			Math																																	
4	32%	37%	41%	34%	27%	21%																															

Maine Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	8	16%	15%	42%	12%	14%	22%	
	HS	11%	10%	50%	10%	6%	22%	
	<p>These data represent progress for 4th grade reading and 8th grade math, and slippage for 8th and 11th grade reading and 4th and 11th grade math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target for 4th grade math. The State did not meet its other FFY 2006 targets for this indicator.</p>							
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 1.75%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of reducing the number of districts with significant discrepancies to one.</p> <p>As required by the FFY 2005 response table, the State did not describe the review, and if appropriate revision, of 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 compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the one district identified with a significant discrepancy in FFY 2005.</p>							<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, clarification of its FFY 2004 baseline data and its FFY 2005 progress data, FFY 2006 progress data, and a description of its review, and if appropriate revision, of 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 compliance with the IDEA for the districts identified with a significant discrepancy. The State provided clarification of its FFY 2004 baseline data and its FFY 2005 progress data and FFY 2006 progress data.</p> <p>While the State reported that the LEA identified with a significant discrepancy in FFY 2005 is receiving technical assistance and has begun developing an improvement plan, OSEP could not determine if the State reviewed, and if appropriate revised, the LEA's 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 compliance</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps				
		<p>with the IDEA. This constitutes noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate, revision, of 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 compliance with the IDEA for the LEA identified with a significant discrepancy in FFY 2005, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p>				
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>					
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p>	<p>The State revised the language in the targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 1443 1419 1485"> <tr> <td data-bbox="550 1443 1062 1485"></td> <td data-bbox="1062 1443 1178 1485">FFY</td> <td data-bbox="1178 1443 1293 1485">FFY</td> <td data-bbox="1293 1443 1419 1485">FFY</td> </tr> </table>		FFY	FFY	FFY	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	FFY	FFY	FFY			

Maine Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps				
<p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>		2005 Data	2006 Data	2006 Target					
	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	57.1%	57.4%	Greater than 61%					
	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	11.2%	11.6%	Less than 12%					
	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	3.5%	3.5%	Less than 4%					
	<p>These data represent progress for Indicator 5A and slippage for Indicator 5B from the FFY 2005 data. For Indicator 5C, these data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 targets for 5B and 5C and did not meet its target for 5A.</p>								
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.								
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1317 1419 1487"> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1317 1060 1487">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</td> <td data-bbox="1060 1317 1178 1487">Social Emotional</td> <td data-bbox="1178 1317 1295 1487">Knowledge & Skills</td> <td data-bbox="1295 1317 1419 1487">Appropriate Behavior</td> </tr> </table>				06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, progress data for children aged three through five and improvement activities. The State provided this information in the</p>
06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior						

Maine Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator; New]</p>	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	0%	25%	0%	<p>FFY 2006 APR. The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	25%	25%	50%		
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	25%	50%	25%		
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	25%	0%	0%		
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	25%	0%	25%		
<p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator that cover the remaining years of the SPP.</p>					
<p>8. 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 87.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 86.1%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 86%.</p>				<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a revised sampling plan and a copy of the parent survey. The State provided a copy of the parent survey and provided additional information confirming that a census-based methodology is being used to collect data for this indicator. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data</p>				<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, baseline data from FFY 2005 and FFY</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services based on the State’s calculation of the data.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>2006 progress data on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification, and a description of how the State made that determination. The State provided these data in the FFY 2006 APR.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities and the language in the targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. The State reported that no districts were identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories based on the State’s calculation of the data.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>However, OSEP could not determine if the State provided valid and reliable data, because the State reported the “Analysis of Means calculation was applied to the districts in Maine with greater than 10 students in any non-white ethnic group for each disability.” While the State reported that the calculation was applied to all five ethnic groups, the State does not apply the analysis of means calculation to determine if there is disproportionate representation of white students in specific disability categories in districts that have more than 10 white students, but less than 10 students in any non-white ethnic group.</p> <p>Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, baseline data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 progress data on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification, and a description of how the State made that determination. In addition, the State was required to revise the target language in the SPP (for every year) to more closely align with the measurement for this indicator. The State provided baseline data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 progress data and made the required revisions to its targets.</p> <p>However, the State did not submit valid and reliable data because the State reported the “Analysis of Means calculation was applied to the districts in Maine with greater than 10 students in any non-white ethnic group for each disability.” The State must provide valid and reliable FFY 2005 baseline data and FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 progress data</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 91%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 85%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that nine of nine findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the number of children determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within the State timeline, and for those children whose evaluations were not completed within the State timeline, an indication of the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed, and any reasons for the delays. The State provided the required data in the 2006 APR.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the revised FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, valid and reliable progress data for the required reporting periods for FFY 2005 and</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>birthdays. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>FFY 2006. The State provided the required information. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b).</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 59%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 83%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%. The State reported that 14 of 14 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner. The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school. [Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP, and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 85%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to submit a revised sampling plan. The State reported a census survey of all students exiting high school by any exit method would be used each year for collecting data on this indicator. OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 75%. The revised FFY 2005 data were 74.3% (29 of 39 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 (2004-2005) were corrected in a timely manner).</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, documentation that it is effectively</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>possible but in no case later than one year from identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%. The State reported that 30 of 40 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner and six of the remaining findings were subsequently corrected. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that four LEAs received State-imposed sanctions.</p> <p>The State reported that the monitoring data it provided was based on information for school-aged programs. The State reported during the verification visit that it did not include in Indicator 15 the status of correction of findings of noncompliance with Part B of IDEA regarding preschool children served in Child Development Services (CDS) sites.</p>	<p>identifying and correcting noncompliance related to services for school-aged and preschool children that are publicly placed in private, special purpose schools; data specific to the correction of noncompliance regarding the provision of services to preschool aged children, as set forth in their IEPs/IFSPs; and documentation that it has ensured correction of the noncompliance related to the secondary transition requirements. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP's February 19, 2008 Maine verification letter required the State to provide, within 60 days from the date of that letter: (1) a written assurance that it has removed any specific percentage threshold for identification and correction of Part B noncompliance in CDS sites, and that it has informed all CDS sites in the State of the revocation of its threshold; (2) a written assurance that it has revised its procedures so that the section 619 subgrant to a CDS site is not delayed because of the status of its Part C application; and (3) either clarification that MDOE ensures correction of all noncompliance under Part B of IDEA no later than one year from identification (the date of the Letter of Verification) or revised policies and procedures that ensure correction of identified noncompliance within one year of identification, as required by IDEA sections 612(a)(11) and 616, 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600 and 20 U.S.C.1232 d(b)(3)(E). OSEP has reviewed the information submitted in the FFY 2006 APR and the documentation</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>received from the State on April 3, 2008, and concluded that the State has provided the required assurances and clarification.</p> <p>As required by OSEP’s February 19, 2007 verification letter, the State must, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, report on: (1) the correction of the previously identified noncompliance with Part B of IDEA regarding provision of services to preschool children with disabilities identified in CDS sites that it followed up on in its September 2007 letters; and (2) the correction of noncompliance with Part B of IDEA regarding provision of services to preschool children with disabilities identified in the monitoring reports MDOE issued to CDS sites on July 9, 2007, November 15, 2007 and December 7, 2007.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.</p> <p>In the FFY 2007 APR, in responding to Indicators 11 and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 81.3%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data that were consistent with the data in Table 7. The State provided the required data.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on six hearings. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, maintenance and/or improvement activities for FFY 2006 through FFY 2010. The State provided this information in the FFY 2006 APR.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that one of two resolution sessions held resulted in settlement agreements. The State is not required to provide or meet its targets or provide improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more resolution meetings were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 85%. The State met</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	its FFY 2006 target of 77%.	
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 95%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 95.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>