

Maine Part C FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>The IDEA Part C regulations cited in this APR Response Table as 34 CFR §303.xxx are those regulations which were in effect during FFY 2010. If the State has chosen to implement any of the new regulations published in 76 Federal Register 60140 (September 28, 2011) prior to the required implementation date of July 1, 2012 for a regulation that impacts the measurements for an SPP/ APR indicator, the State must so indicate in its FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</p>		
<p>Status of Public Reporting on EIS Performance: OSEP’s FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, required the State to include in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, confirmation that the State reported on the FFY 2008 performance of each EIS program on the targets in the SPP for Indicators 2, 4, 5, and 6. The Web link that the State provided with its FFY 2010 APR demonstrated that the State publicly reported on the performance of each EIS program for both FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 against the targets for all required indicators, including Indicators 2, 4, 5, and 6.</p>		
<p>1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 92.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator was corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that two of five 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>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1). 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>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 three 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</p>

Maine Part C FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 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 the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator, and each EIS program with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) are correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(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 initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated</p>

Maine Part C FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
		<p>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>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>2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 91%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 85%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 95%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>																								
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationship); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 878 1583 1518"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 878 957 979"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 878 1163 979"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 878 1369 979"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1369 878 1583 979"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 979 957 1117">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 979 1163 1117">43.5</td> <td data-bbox="1163 979 1369 1117">42</td> <td data-bbox="1369 979 1583 1117">53</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1117 957 1284">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1117 1163 1284">53.5</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1117 1369 1284">52</td> <td data-bbox="1369 1117 1583 1284">60</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1284 957 1385">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1284 1163 1385">54.7</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1284 1369 1385">56</td> <td data-bbox="1369 1284 1583 1385">53</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1385 957 1485"><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 1385 1163 1485"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 1385 1369 1485"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1369 1385 1583 1485"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1485 957 1518">Outcome A:</td> <td data-bbox="957 1485 1163 1518">42.1</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1485 1369 1518">52</td> <td data-bbox="1369 1485 1583 1518">41</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) (%)	43.5	42	53	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	53.5	52	60	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	54.7	56	53	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A:	42.1	52	41	<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 2011 APR.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 in 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) (%)	43.5	42	53																							
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	53.5	52	60																							
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	54.7	56	53																							
<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																							
Outcome A:	42.1	52	41																							

Maine Part C FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
	Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)																								
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	26.8	33	27																					
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	38.6	48	38																					
	These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.																								
<p>4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:</p> <p>A. Know their rights; B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs; and C. Help their children develop and learn.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 732 1577 1105"> <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. Know their rights (%)</td> <td>76</td> <td>90</td> <td>91</td> <td>14.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)</td> <td>82</td> <td>92</td> <td>91</td> <td>10.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Help their children develop and learn (%)</td> <td>82</td> <td>92</td> <td>91</td> <td>10.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 targets for 4B and 4C and did not meet its target for 4A.</p>					<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. Know their rights (%)	76	90	91	14.00%	B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)	82	92	91	10.00%	C. Help their children develop and learn (%)	82	92	91	10.00%	<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 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																					
A. Know their rights (%)	76	90	91	14.00%																					
B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)	82	92	91	10.00%																					
C. Help their children develop and learn (%)	82	92	91	10.00%																					
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0.52%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 0.64%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0.82%.</p>				<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>																				
<p>6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 2.37%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 2.29%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 2.81%.</p>				<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in</p>																				

Maine Part C FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]		the FFY 2011 APR.
<p>7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 85%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 64.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2009, the State did not make any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2009. The State explained that, "While [Child Development Services' (CDS')] data were 64.6%, all programs identified with noncompliance have longstanding findings with this indicator that have not yet been verified as corrected. CDS did not make new findings of noncompliance in FFY 2009 but used the FFY 2009 data to further inform the corrective actions required by the programs to ensure correction of the longstanding noncompliance."</p> <p>The State reported that none of the remaining three 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 must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State is in compliance with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a). 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>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 three 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 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</p>

Maine Part C FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>correction; and (4) any new or different actions the State will take to ensure such correction.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified FFY 2010 for this indicator, and each EIS program with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) are correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) (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 conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, 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>

Maine Part C FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 87%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 86.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2009, the State did not make any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2009. The State explained that, "While CDS' data were 86.6%, all programs identified with noncompliance have longstanding findings with this indicator that have not yet been verified as corrected. CDS did not make new findings of noncompliance in FFY 2009 but used the FFY 2009 data to further inform the corrective actions required by the programs to ensure correction of the longstanding noncompliance."</p> <p>The State reported that the one remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 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 IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) and 20 U.S.C. 1436(a)(3) and (d)(8). 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>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 one remaining finding 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 the remaining finding of noncompliance, and any new or different actions the State has taken, since the submission of its FFY 2010 APR, to ensure such</p>

Maine Part C FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>correction; and (4) any new or different actions the State will take to ensure such correction.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator, and the EIS program with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) are correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) and 20 U.S.C. 1436(a)(3) and (d)(8) (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 an IFSP with transition steps and services for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program (i.e., the child has exited the State's Part C program due to age or other reasons), 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</p>

Maine Part C FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		compliance.
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1).</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 93%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 94.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that the one remaining 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 reported that one of four findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 was corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that the one remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 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 timely transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)). 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>OSEP is concerned about the State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance from FFY 2008, FFY 2007, and FFY 2006. 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, the remaining three findings identified in FFY 2007,</p>

Maine Part C FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>and the remaining one finding identified in FFY 2006. 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 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 the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator, the EIS program with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008, and each EIS program with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) are correctly implementing 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data</p>

Maine Part C FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) have conducted a transition conference, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, 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 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>9. 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 15.79%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 14 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that one of four findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 was corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that three of 13 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 reported that the one remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 was not corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009. However, OSEP is concerned about the State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance from FFY 2008, FFY 2007, and FFY 2006. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2011 APR that it has corrected the remaining three findings identified in FFY 2008, the remaining ten findings identified in FFY 2007, and the one</p>

Maine Part C FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<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>remaining finding identified in FFY 2006. 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 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 in the FFY 2011 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, the State must report that it verified that each EIS program with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (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</p>

Maine Part C FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>jurisdiction of the EIS program, 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>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>10. 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that it did not receive any signed written complaints during the reporting period.</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>11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that it did not receive any requests for due process hearings during the reporting period.</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>12. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).</p>	<p>The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that no resolution sessions were held during the reporting period.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2010. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>

Maine Part C FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.	
<p>13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that no mediations were held during the reporting period.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2010. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.
<p>14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616, 618, and 642 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 303.540. In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.