

Maine Part C FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 2005 reported data for this indicator are 91%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%. This represents slippage from the FFY 2004 data of 95%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR data that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1). The data in the FFY 2005 APR show 91% compliance.</p> <p>The State did not report data regarding the number of delays due to documented exceptional family circumstances. If the State collects these data and wishes to include them in the measurement, the number of children for whom the timeline was not met due to documented exceptional family circumstances would be included in both the numerator and the denominator of the measurement for this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, and the State must provide the specific numbers for its calculation.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1), including the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</p>
<p>2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 89%. This represents progress from FFY 2004 data of 87%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 90%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>It is also important that the State monitor to ensure that IFSP teams make individualized decisions regarding the settings in which infants and toddlers receive early intervention services, in accordance with Part C natural environment requirements.</p>
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional</p>	<p>The State reported the required entry data and activities.</p>	<p>The State must provide progress data and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to clarify in the FFY 2005 APR whether or not it was using a sampling methodology to collect</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>		<p>data. The State informed OSEP in the SPP that a sampling method would no longer be used to collect data for this indicator. The revised SPP reflects the new approach for collecting the required data.</p>
<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;</p> <p>B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and</p> <p>C. Help their children develop and learn.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State's reported FFY 2005 baseline data are:</p> <p>4A. 83.9%</p> <p>4B. 82.9%</p> <p>4C. 82.9%</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets, and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to clarify in the February 1, 2007 APR whether or not they were using a sampling methodology to collect data. The State informed OSEP in the revised SPP that a census method is being utilized to collect data for this indicator.</p>
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:</p> <p>A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and</p> <p>B. National data.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator under IDEA section 618 are .65%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of .71%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of .75%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]		
<p>6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:</p> <p>A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and</p> <p>B. National data.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator under IDEA section 618 are 2.89%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 2.80%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter informed the State that if it does not revise its eligibility criteria (as proposed in the SPP), it must revise its targets to reflect improvement.</p> <p>The State did not change its eligibility criteria and revised its targets for this indicator to show improvement from its baseline. OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<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 2005 reported data for this indicator are 94.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%. This represents progress from the FFY 2004 data of 93.3%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR data that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a).</p> <p>The State did not report data regarding the number of delays due to documented exceptional family circumstances. If the State collects these data and wishes to include them in the measurement, the number of children for whom the timeline was not met due to documented exceptional family circumstances would be included in both the numerator and the denominator of the measurement for this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, and the State must provide the specific numbers for its calculation.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a), including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</p>
<p>8A. 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</p>	<p>OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target because the State provided no data.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include, in the FFY 2005 APR, data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006) that meet the required measurements for Indicator 8A.</p> <p>The State did not provide any data for FFY 2005 in response to Indicator 8A. However, the State indicated that it has implemented a new form to include the required information, and that a new data system is being developed to provide</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>third birthday including:</p> <p>A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>		<p>data for this indicator. The State also indicated that data collection from the new forms was expected to begin in March 2007.</p> <p>The State must provide the required data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 to demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h).</p>
<p>8B. 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 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include, in the FFY 2005 APR, data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006) that meet the required measurements for Indicator 8B.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate continued compliance with the requirements in 303.148(b)(1).</p>
<p>8C. 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>OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target because the State provided no data.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include, in the FFY 2005 APR, data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006) that meet the required measurements for Indicator 8C.</p> <p>The State did not submit any data for this indicator. However, the State indicated that it has implemented a new form to include the required information, and that a new data system is being developed to provide data for this indicator. The State also indicated that data collection from the new forms was expected to begin in March 2007.</p> <p>The State must provide the required data in the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008, to demonstrate compliance with the requirement in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9).</p>
<p>9. General supervision system (including monitoring,</p>	<p>OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target because the</p>	<p>In the SPP submitted in December 2005, the State indicated that it was 100% compliant for Indicator 9, but it did not provide any data as to how it arrived at</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>State provided no data.</p>	<p>its 100% calculation and did not describe whether and what findings the State made as a result of its on-site monitoring of the 16 Child Development Services (CDS) visited during the summer of 2005. OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR data demonstrating compliance (i.e., data regarding findings identified during FFY 2004 and corrected during FFY 2005), including whether or not identified noncompliance was corrected within one year.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2005 APR provides neither the required FFY 2005 data, or any narrative on whether, when or what findings the State made as a result of the 16 CDS monitoring on-site visits conducted during the summer of 2005. The State's FFY 2005 APR indicated only that it had conducted "monitoring visits in the summer of 2006" to identify areas of need but provided no details as to if, when and what findings were made. Although the State indicated in its September 2005 progress report that it had conducted monitoring of its 16 CDS sites and made corrections, it is unclear if the State is monitoring for compliance with Part C requirements, making findings as a result of monitoring, requiring corrective actions and ensuring timely correction of identified noncompliance.</p> <p>In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must: (1) confirm that the State has made findings of noncompliance with Part C requirements; (2) provide a list of the findings made by CDS site; (3) describe the corrective actions required of each CDS site, and (4) report on data demonstrating compliance with the timely correction requirements in IDEA sections 616(a), 642, and 635(a)(10) and 34 CFR §303.501(b), including information regarding the correction of noncompliance identified by the State as a result of its on-site monitoring visits conducted during FFY 2005 and the summer of 2006.</p> <p>In its response to Indicator 9 in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must disaggregate by APR indicator the status of timely correction of the noncompliance findings identified by the State during FFY 2005. In addition, the State must, in responding to Indicators 1 and 7, specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators. The State must also report on the correction of any noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 for Indicators 8A and 8C.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The Lead Agency received no complaints during the FFY 2005 reporting period.</p>	<p>The Lead Agency received no complaints during the FFY 2005 reporting period.</p>
<p>11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>No hearings were requested during the FFY 2005 reporting period.</p>	<p>No hearings were requested during the FFY 2005 reporting period.</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>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>No resolution sessions were held during the FFY 2005 reporting period.</p>	<p>No resolution sessions were held during the FFY 2005 reporting period. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more resolution meetings were held. In any FFY where 10 or more resolution meetings are held, the State must set targets for this indicator based on its baseline data.</p>
<p>13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>No Part C mediations were held during FFY 2005.</p>	<p>No Part C mediations were held during FFY 2005. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more mediations were conducted.</p>
<p>14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report)</p>	<p>Although the State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%, the State did not meet the</p>	<p>OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to revise its targets in the FFY 2005 APR to indicate its intent to reach 100% timeliness and 100% accuracy regarding data reported in the APRs, as well as under section</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>100% FFY 2005 target.</p>	<p>618.</p> <p>The State revised the SPP targets for this indicator as requested, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>Although the State reported 100% compliance for this indicator, OSEP's review confirms that the State did not report any of the required FFY 2005 data in the APR for Indicators 8A, 8C, and 9.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in IDEA sections 616, 618 and 642, and 34 CFR §§303.176 and 303.540.</p>