

**Table A – MAINE Part B
Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan**

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>On page 9 of the SPP, the State reported that the data provided “are not the most accurate,” and that “truly comparable data will become available in 2007.”</p>	<p>The State must include, in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, accurate data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). Failure to provide accurate data at that time may affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>On page 12 of the SPP, the State indicated that the “comparable drop-out data” reported for 2004-2005 are not the most accurate data and that they will report data that are more accurate in 2007.</p>	<p>The State must include, in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, accurate data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). Failure to provide accurate data at that time may affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>OSEP could not determine if the State plans to use sampling in collecting data for this indicator. If so, it is important that the State have a technically sound sampling plan to ensure that data used for entry, baseline, or to report on progress, are valid and reliable. The submission of invalid data is inconsistent with Federal statute and regulations, including section 616(b)(2)(B) of the IDEA, and will affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>	<p>If the State intends to collect information through sampling, its SPP must include sampling methodology to ensure the collection of valid and reliable data on which to base its targets and improvement activities. The State must submit the revised sampling methodology that describes how data were collected with the State’s FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007. If the State decides not to sample, but rather gather census data, please inform OSEP and revise the SPP accordingly.</p>

**Table A – MAINE Part B
Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan**

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>On page 67 of the SPP, the State indicated that it would pilot a post-high school survey in 27 sites, plus five LEAs that are part of a General Supervision Enhancement Grant. However, the plan is unclear in that it does not indicate what will happen beyond the first year. OSEP could not determine if the State plans to use sampling in collecting data for this indicator. If so, it is important that the State have a technically sound sampling plan to ensure that data used for entry, baseline, or to report on progress, are valid and reliable. The submission of invalid data is inconsistent with Federal statute and regulations, including section 616(b)(2)(B) of the IDEA, and will affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>	<p>The State must decide whether or not, as a result of the pilot, it will survey ALL exiting youth with IEPs within one year of leaving high school, or will sample this group. If the State intends to collect information through sampling, the SPP must include sampling methodology to ensure the collection of valid and reliable data on which to base its targets and improvement activities. The State must submit the revised sampling methodology that describes how data were collected with the State's FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007. If the State decides not to sample, but rather gather census data, please inform OSEP and revise the SPP accordingly.</p>
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>The State did not use the required measurements in reporting its data for this indicator.</p>	<p>The State must include the required data and calculations in reporting its performance on this indicator in the APR, due February 1, 2007. Failure to include this information may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Noncompliance: On page 73 of the SPP, the State reported an 83% level of compliance for indicator 16, specifically the timeline requirement at 34 CFR §300.661(a) and (b). Baseline data indicate that 15 of 18 State complaints were completed within timelines and that three that went beyond the timelines were completed in 61 days (two of three) and 68 days (one of three).</p>	<p>The State must ensure that this noncompliance is corrected within one year of its identification and include data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate compliance with this requirement. The State should review and, if necessary revise, its improvement strategies included in the SPP to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the APR that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement. Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>