

Maine Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 65.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 64.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 86%.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 5.5%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 5.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 2.0%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 56%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 95%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 98%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97% for reading and for math. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 97% for reading and for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 98%.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]		
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator for grades 3-8 are 31% for reading and 28% for math. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 31% for reading and represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 29% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 75% for reading and 78% for math for grades 3-8.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator for high school are 17% for reading and 15% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 15% for reading and 13% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 70% for reading and 66% for math for high school.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that 144 of 155 districts met the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students and more than one student with an IEP suspended or expelled.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, 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 and do not comply with requirements relating to the</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed the way data were reported. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that 144 of 155 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students of any race/ethnicity and more than one student of any race/ethnicity with an IEP suspended or expelled.</p> <p>OSEP’s FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, required the State to</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>clarify in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, its definition of “significant discrepancy” and provide the required data for FFY 2010 (using 2009-2010 data). The State provided all of the required information.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2010 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>																					
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 695 1583 1170"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">56</td> <td align="center">55</td> <td align="center">65</td> <td align="center">-1.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">10.6</td> <td align="center">10.8</td> <td align="center">9</td> <td align="center">-0.20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">3.2</td> <td align="center">3.3</td> <td align="center">3.1</td> <td align="center">-0.10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	56	55	65	-1.00%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	10.6	10.8	9	-0.20%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	3.2	3.3	3.1	-0.10%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	56	55	65	-1.00%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	10.6	10.8	9	-0.20%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	3.2	3.3	3.1	-0.10%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>	<p>The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>																				

Maine Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																
<p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>																																		
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 496 1583 1507"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 496 959 596"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="959 496 1163 596"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 496 1373 596"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 496 1583 596"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 596 959 732">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 596 1163 732">60.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 596 1373 732">54</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 596 1583 732">64</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 732 959 899">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 732 1163 899">59.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 732 1373 899">61</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 732 1583 899">67</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 899 959 1002">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 899 1163 1002">63.5</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 899 1373 1002">54</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 899 1583 1002">59</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1002 959 1101"><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th data-bbox="959 1002 1163 1101"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 1002 1373 1101"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 1002 1583 1101"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1101 959 1237">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 1101 1163 1237">37</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1101 1373 1237">36</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1101 1583 1237">38</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1237 959 1404">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 1237 1163 1404">31.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1237 1373 1404">33</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1237 1583 1404">36</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1404 959 1507">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 1404 1163 1507">53</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1404 1373 1507">48</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1404 1583 1507">52</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	60.9	54	64	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	59.9	61	67	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	63.5	54	59	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	37	36	38	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	31.3	33	36	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	53	48	52	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																															
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	60.9	54	64																															
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	59.9	61	67																															
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	63.5	54	59																															
<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																															
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	37	36	38																															
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	31.3	33	36																															
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	53	48	52																															

Maine Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 90%. The FFY 2009 data were 91%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 91%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> <p>The State did not report the number of districts that did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>In its FFY 2011 APR, the State must report the number of districts that did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement.</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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> <p>The State reported that 145 of 150 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of greater than ten students with disabilities in any race/ethnicity category.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 88.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 84.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 20 of 35 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that 13 findings were subsequently corrected by April</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirement in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>17, 2012. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that none of the remaining four CDS findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2010 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the remaining two uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2009 and the remaining four uncorrected noncompliance CDS findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009, each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2007, and each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) are correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (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) have completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>OSEP is concerned about the State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance from FFY 2007. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2011 APR that it has corrected the remaining four findings identified in FFY 2007. If the State cannot report in the FFY 2011 APR that this noncompliance has been corrected, the State must report in the FFY 2011 APR: (1) the specific nature of the noncompliance; (2) the State's explanation as to why the noncompliance has persisted; (3) the steps that the State has taken to ensure the correction of each finding of the remaining findings of noncompliance, and any new or different actions the State has taken, since the submission of its FFY 2010 APR, to ensure such correction; and (4) any new or different actions the State will take to ensure such correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100%</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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 birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 92.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 91.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that one of three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 was corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 was not corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2010 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the remaining two uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2009 and the remaining one uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2008 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009, the LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008, and each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) are correctly</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (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) have developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>OSEP is concerned about the State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance from FFY 2008. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2011 APR that it has corrected the one remaining finding identified in FFY 2008. If the State cannot report in the FFY 2011 APR that this noncompliance has been corrected, the State must report in the FFY 2011 APR: (1) the specific nature of the noncompliance; (2) the State's explanation as to why the noncompliance has persisted; (3) the steps that the State has taken to ensure the correction of each finding of the remaining findings</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>of noncompliance, and any new or different actions the State has taken, since the submission of its FFY 2010 APR, to ensure such correction; and (4) any new or different actions the State will take to ensure such correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 47%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 88%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 16 of 36 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that 11 findings were subsequently corrected by April 17, 2012. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the remaining nine uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2009 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps										
[Compliance Indicator]		<p>identified in FFY 2009, and each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) are correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (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) have 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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>										
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts that revision. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets.</p> <p>The State's reported revised baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1349 1583 1516"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1349 938 1450"></th> <th data-bbox="938 1349 1100 1450"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1100 1349 1262 1450"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1262 1349 1423 1450"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th data-bbox="1423 1349 1583 1450"><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1450 938 1516">A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td data-bbox="938 1450 1100 1516"></td> <td data-bbox="1100 1450 1262 1516">25</td> <td data-bbox="1262 1450 1423 1516">35</td> <td data-bbox="1423 1450 1583 1516">-10.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education		25	35	-10.00%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>								
A. % Enrolled in higher education		25	35	-10.00%								

Maine Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</p>		<p align="center">76.6</p>	<p align="center">92</p>	<p align="center">-15.40%</p>	
	<p>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed</p>		<p align="center">82.3</p>	<p align="center">94</p>	<p align="center">-9.70%</p>	
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 data for this indicator are 71.22%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 42.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%. The State reported that 99 of 139 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that 26 findings were subsequently corrected by April 17, 2012. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance. The State reported that one of the remaining 13 findings of noncompliance identified in</p>					<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the remaining 14 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009, and the remaining 12 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008, and the remaining 19 findings of</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>FFY 2008, and none of the remaining 19 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007, were corrected. For these remaining findings of noncompliance, the State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2010 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>noncompliance identified in FFY 2007, that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2010 APR, were corrected.</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 2011 APR, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2010 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02. OSEP is concerned about the State’s failure to correct longstanding noncompliance from FFY 2008 and FFY 2007. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2011 APR that it has corrected the remaining 12 findings identified in FFY 2008 and the remaining 19 findings identified in FFY 2007. If the State cannot report in the FFY 2011 APR that this noncompliance has been corrected, the State must report in the FFY 2011 APR: (1) the specific nature of the noncompliance; (2) the State’s explanation as to why the noncompliance has persisted; (3) the steps that the State has taken to ensure the correction of each</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>finding of the remaining findings of noncompliance, and any new or different actions the State has taken, since the submission of its FFY 2010 APR, to ensure such correction; and (4) any new or different actions the State will take to ensure such correction.</p> <p>When reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		Further, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described 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, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</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 adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data are based on two due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline 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>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 20%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 58%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>

Maine Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	Resolution data until July 2012.	
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 73%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 77%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 85%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State’s data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<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’s FFY 2010 data for this indicator are 90%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 98.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2011 APR, demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>