



IDEA PART C Annual Performance Report

FFY 2012

July 1, 2012

through

June 30, 2013

Submitted: January 31, 2014

Table of Contents

OVERVIEW OF THE ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT DEVELOPMENT: 3
PUBLIC REPORTING TABLE FFY 2012: 6
MONITORING PRIORITY: EARLY INTERVENTION SERVICES IN NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS..... 7
INDICATOR 1: 7
INDICATOR 2: 12
INDICATOR 3: 14
INDICATOR 4: 20
MONITORING PRIORITY: EFFECTIVE GENERAL SUPERVISION PART C / CHILD FIND 22
INDICATOR 5: 22
INDICATOR 6: 24
INDICATOR 7: 26
**MONITORING PRIORITY: EFFECTIVE GENERAL SUPERVISION PART C / EFFECTIVE TRANSITION
..... 31**
INDICATOR 8A: 31
INDICATOR 8B: 36
INDICATOR 8C: 39
**MONITORING PRIORITY: EFFECTIVE GENERAL SUPERVISION PART C / GENERAL SUPERVISION
..... 44**
INDICATOR 9: 44
INDICATOR 12: 51
INDICATOR 13: 53
INDICATOR 14: 54

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

This APR is the eighth report of the progress toward the targets established in the State Performance Plan (SPP) on December 2, 2005 and extended on February 1, 2011. The SPP, APR and the performance of each regional site may be found at <http://www.maine.gov/doe/specialed/support/spp/index.html>. The SPP posted is the most recent and has not been revised. This APR reports the progress towards the Measureable and Rigorous Targets established in the SPP for all indicators. Child Development Services (CDS), the governmental entity that serves as an Intermediate Educational Unit (IEU) of the Maine Department of Education (MDOE), provides data and analysis for all of the Part C indicators and some of the Part B indicators due to the symbiotic nature of CDS' relationship with the MDOE, described in state statute: The MDOE Commissioner, "shall establish and supervise the state intermediate educational unit. The state intermediate educational unit is established as a body corporate and politic and as a public instrumentality of the State for the purpose of conducting child find activities as provided in 20 United States Code, Section 1412 (a) (3) for children from birth to under 6 years of age, ensuring the provision of early intervention services for eligible children from birth to under 3 years of age and ensuring a free, appropriate public education for eligible children at least 3 years of age and under 6 years of age." MRSA 20- A§7209(3)

Stakeholder Group Activities:

The newly comprised State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) completed its first full reporting year in FFY 2012. In March 2012, it was determined by the Governor that the SICC and the State Advisory Panel (SAP) roles would be divided into two separate groups and function independently. At the time of review of this APR, SICC appointments had been made and have reviewed this report. The CDS State IEU has worked closely with the co-chairs and members of the council to educate them on the purpose and expectation of the SICC and the APR/SPP.

The council consists of 13 people: four commissioners, one legislator, three members of public or private providers of early intervention services, one member involved in personnel preparation, one member from a Head Start or Early Head Start agency or program in the state, and three parents. Meeting minutes and agendas can be found at <http://www.maine.gov/doe/specialed/idea/advisory/meetings.html>. The council met five times between November 2012 and May 2013. Four of those times were focused on the APR. During those meetings, members were informed about indicators and targets, reviewed the APR/SPP, and provided feedback.

A representative from the Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC) attended a meeting to provide the SICC with guidance on what their role and responsibilities are as a SICC as well as federal and state initiatives, their fit into the state's strategic plan developed by the Maine Commissioner of Education and results driven accountability.

Child Development Services System:

Over the last year CDS has again, encountered change. In the summer of 2012 Cindy Brown was appointed as CDS State Director. The Aroostook and York sites had a change in leadership and interim directors were appointed. Also, the regional site directors at Downeast and Midcoast retired and interim directors were named.

The nine regional site directors meet at least two times a month, at the CDS State IEU located at the MDOE, for Regional Site Leadership Team (RSLT) meeting. The CDS State IEU facilitates the meetings. The meeting agendas include such topics as: procedures; regulations; and problem solving. Regular meetings provide opportunities for regional site directors to support one another and for the CDS State

IEU staff to provide updates, technical assistance (TA), and answer any questions regional site directors may have.

The CDS State IEU Leadership Team meets regularly to discuss a variety of topics including fiscal, policy, data, human resource and site performance across all areas. The CDS State IEU Leadership Team is made up of the CDS State Director, Deputy Director, Quality Assurance Director, Data Director, Human Resources Director and the Finance Director.

In order to help achieve consistency throughout the nine sites the Deputy Director and the Quality Assurance Director became Points of Contact (POC) for the regional sites. The basic function of the POC is to be the primary communication between the regional sites and the state office.

The Case-e system is a web-based, State-level database which all regional sites access to provide the recording of child specific information relating to demographics, assessments, services, team meetings, Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs), insurance information, and billing. Case-e continues to undergo improvements which support our ongoing oversight of the interrelationship of the fiscal, data, and monitoring systems and supports data gathering for the APR. The CDS State IEU with the help of the Maine Office of Information Technology (OIT) has begun to evaluate the current data system for future needs. OIT designated a project coordinator and in the spring of 2013 began evaluating the needs of the CDS system.

CDS State IEU assisted in the development of the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) application, which was awarded to Maine in October 2011. Within the grant there are two areas designated to assist in professional development for Part C. Goal 4 which is to increase the percentages of children, age's birth through two, receiving timely, evidence-based early intervention services in their natural environments by qualified personnel, with the objectives, to increase the numbers of IDEA Part C teams and personnel trained in implementing the evidence-based early intervention model and to increase the compliance of School Administrative Units (SAUs) (regional sites) in meeting the required steps/timelines in developing the IFSP. Goal 4 professional development and implementation was guided by the Part C consultant and included: statewide training for a team from each regional site and select providers in writing high quality outcome statements and a Part C process guide was developed (pre-referral to exit). The Part C process guide was developed to support regional sites in implementing early intervention in Maine. Goal 5 is to increase the percentages of SAU special education and related services personnel who can develop and implement effective, compliant transition plans and activities within timelines. Of the four objectives that span from early intervention to preschool transition and post-secondary transition objective 5.3 is to improve the percentages of SAUs with effective transition plans and activities for children with disabilities from IDEA Part C to Part B and preschool to kindergarten.

The CDS State Director serves as a member of the State Agency Interdepartmental Early Learning and Development Team (SAIEL). The purpose of SAIEL is to serve as the administrative governance structure between the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Human Services to ensure interagency coordination, streamline decision-making, allocate resources effectively, incorporate findings from the various demonstration projects statewide, and create long term sustainability for its early learning and development reform. More information regarding this collaborative effort can be found at <http://www.maine.gov/doe/saielgroups/>.

Alignment with National Technical Assistance Resources:

Maine utilizes technical assistance, professional development and dissemination resources throughout the State to provide scientifically based materials and instruction to educators, parents and interested parties. CDS contracted with an individual (Part C consultant) to provide TA, encompassing all Part C indicators, to Part C professionals throughout the year. She represented CDS at meetings at various state and national groups, managed the Part C process document, assisted in the implementation of the standardized Part C forms, provided training on the Part C process and forms to regional sites, attended CDS RSLT meetings, developed information for improving CDS Child Find efforts, and led the Part C professional development committee. All work done by contracted individuals must be consistent with

APR Template – Part C (1)

____ Maine ____
State

Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) SPP and APR indicators as well as Maine Unified Special Education Regulations (MUSER).

Additionally, CDS has requested assistance in the areas of natural environments for birth through two, eligibility timelines, unmet needs, child outcomes, C to B transition, General Supervision System, APR assistance, and data analysis from the Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC), the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTACenter) previously known as National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC), OSEP, Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center, the Infant and Toddlers Coordinators Association (ITCA), and the Data Accountability Center (DAC). CDS State IEU personnel participate in OSEP, NECTAC, and NERRC teleconferences and conferences as frequently as possible.

Improvement Activities:

The SICC reviewed the improvement activities in the current SPP and will continue with these activities in its current SPP until the development of the next SPP including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The SPP was not revised in FFY 2012.

APR Template – Part C (1)

Maine
State

Public Reporting Table FFY 2012:

The Part C regulations at 34 CFR §303.702(b) requires each State to report annually to the public on the performance of each Early Intervention Service (EIS) program located in the State on the targets in the State's state performance plan, "as soon as practicable but no later than 120 days" following the State's APR submission. The following table is posted online with the APR and serves as public reporting on the state targets and performance of each EIS program for Indicators 1-8 in FFY 2012:

CDS Regional Sites	C1	C2	C3a		C3b		C3c		C4			C5	C6	C7	C8a	C8b	C8c
	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
	100%	95%	53%	41%	60%	27%	53%	38%	91%	91%	91%	0.82%	2.81%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Aroostook County	94%	98%	25%	33%	17%	17%	33%	17%	100%	92%	100%	0.60%	2.28%	48%	100%	100%	58%
CDS Reach	95%	98%	0%	20%	25%	20%	50%	40%	96%	100%	98%	0.76%	2.87%	83%	99%	100%	88%
CDS First Step	100%	98%	25%	43%	67%	14%	67%	43%	97%	95%	100%	1.30%	3.67%	90%	100%	100%	81%
Two Rivers	99%	97%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0.38%	1.20%	97%	98%	100%	86%
Midcoast Regional CDS	100%	98%	0%	0%	33%	0%	33%	0%	95%	100%	95%	0.88%	2.82%	88%	99%	100%	91%
Opportunities	100%	100%	50%	67%	40%	33%	40%	33%	92%	92%	96%	0.87%	2.14%	97%	100%	100%	84%
Project PEDS	100%	100%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	96%	92%	92%	0.71%	2.18%	98%	98%	100%	89%
Child Development Services Downeast	100%	89%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0.99%	3.40%	93%	100%	100%	77%
York County	100%	99%	0%	33%	0%	33%	67%	33%	100%	100%	100%	0.21%	1.98%	82%	99%	100%	79%
State Totals	99%	98%	24%	37%	37%	23%	48%	34%	97%	97%	98%	0.70%	2.42%	89%	99%	100%	83%

Public Reporting for FFY 2008-2012: <http://www.maine.gov/doe/specialed/support/spp/index.html>

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2012	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

99%

Data were collected from the State database (Case-e) for all infants and toddlers for the reporting period of July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013. If there were documented exceptional family circumstances, they would have been included in both the numerator and denominator of the calculation. Findings of noncompliance are made based on this data.

Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive Early Intervention Services in a Timely Manner:

a. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	1890
b. Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	1916
Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	99%

Reasons for Delay	Count
CDS (no delay reason was given and/or delay was caused by regional	6

site/ staff)	
No available openings*	17
No provider available**	2
Provider interruption	1
Documented exceptional family circumstance	0
Total	26
*No available openings – Provider is available but has no time available.	
**No provider available – No provider is available.	

Public Reporting of FFY 2012 APR Data:

Site	% Timely
Aroostook County	94%
CDS Reach	95%
CDS First Step	100%
Two Rivers	99%
Midcoast Regional CDS	100%
Opportunities	100%
Project PEDS	100%
Child Development Services Downeast	100%
York County	100%
State Total	99%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012¹:

Maine did not reach its target although the State has slightly increased the level of compliance since FFY 2011 year (97%).

Previous years' data were:

FFY 2010	99%
FFY 2009	92.9%
FFY 2008	91%
FFY 2007	94.5%
FFY 2006	95.4%

¹ In an effort to reduce reporting burden, in the FFY 2012 APR, States: 1) Are not required to provide an explanation of: a) progress; b) no change in actual target data from the data for FFY 2011; or c) slippage if the State meets its target. 2) Are not required to discuss improvement activities for: a) compliance indicators where the State reports 100% compliance for FFY 2012; and b) results indicators where the State has met its FFY 2012 target. 3) May provide one set of improvement activities for the entire APR as long as the Improvement Activities are indexed back to reference the relevant indicators.

Although not yet meeting target, CDS as a system has shown an increase ensuring all infants and toddlers with IFSPs receive their services within a timely manner. A variety of activities have occurred at both the State and regional site level to ensure all infants and toddlers with IFSPs receive their services in a timely manner. In addition to the activities listed below, personnel from the CDS State IEU including some regional site staff and the Part C consultant participated in national and state focused TA activities. TA was received from NERRC and NECTAC through webinars, phone conversations, and a review of information posted on websites. Pertinent information was shared with regional site directors via email, at their RSLT meetings, or through regional site webinars.

Activities initiated or required by the CDS State IEU over the last year included:

- CDS State IEU provided compliance reports to regional sites monthly which included all infants and toddlers who were found to not have services initiated within 30 days of their IFSP being completed.
- The Maine Part C Professional Development team provided training and clarification on rules, regulations and procedures to CDS Part C Team.
- All regional sites had at least one Part C Early Intervention Team providing evaluations and services using evidence based early intervention model.
- The CDS State IEU developed a mechanism for regional sites to enter into block contracts with individuals to assist in meeting infant and toddler’s needs.
- The CDS State Director required all regional Part C Teams to meet weekly.
- The mandated referral form was revised to include a provider update to ensure the regional site knows if a provider is able to accept a referral for services. If the provider is unable to accept the referral an alternate referral is made.
- Initiated Corrective Action Plan (CAP) calls at least bimonthly where the Deputy Director and Quality Assurance Director received updates on the progress of each regional site’s CAP.

Activities completed by regional sites:

- Regional teams reviewed compliance at least monthly within their Part C Team meetings.
- Home visits were made within 30 days of the IFSP date.
- Case managers immediately notified the Part C team leader and regional site director if it appeared as though additional provider options were necessary to ensure timely service delivery.
- Based on the compliance reports provided by the CDS State IEU the regional sites reported back on all infants and toddlers who were out of compliance.

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2011 for this indicator: 97%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012)	4
2. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State verified as timely corrected (verified as corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	4
3. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2011 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3))	0
---	----------

APR Template – Part C (1)

Maine
State

above)	
5. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
6. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

All findings of noncompliance for FFY 2011 have been timely corrected.

Verification of Correction of FFY 2011 noncompliance (either timely or subsequent):

Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2011 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the State data system (Case-e); and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance and has provided services although late for any child whose services were not delivered timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the regional site, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011:

Specifically, to verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from Case-e, performed on-site file reviews, and verified subsequent data submitted through regional site self-assessments and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The subsequent time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance with the specific regulatory requirements varied based on the level of noncompliance identified in the program.

Through Case-e, CDS was also able to verify that each child received services, although late.

In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, CDS State IEU also complied with the requirements to account for all instances of noncompliance identified through its database as well as on-site monitoring and other monitoring procedures; identify the level, location (regional site), and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any regional site with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit CAPs. CDS State IEU and the regional site created the CAP. These activities ranged from providing staff training, attending required TA, submitting monthly reports to the CDS State IEU and completing CAP check in calls with the CDS State IEU.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

There were no remaining uncorrected FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013, FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator.

1. Number of remaining uncorrected FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013, FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator	0
2. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected	0
3. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2010 findings:

APR Template – Part C (1)

There were no remaining uncorrected FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013, FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010:

There were no remaining uncorrected FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013, FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2009 or Earlier (if applicable):

There were no remaining uncorrected FFY 2009 or Earlier findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013, FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State’s Response
<p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (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 EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	<p>CDS reports on the verification of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 in the “Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance” section above.</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):

Improvement activities have been reviewed by CDS State IEU and SICC and no changes have been made.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2012	95%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

98%

Data were collected from the State database (Case-e) for 618 reporting on December 1, 2012 and reported on February 6, 2013.

Public Reporting of FFY 2012 APR Data:

Site	% home or community-based
Aroostook County	98%
CDS Reach	98%
CDS First Step	98%
Two Rivers	97%
Midcoast Regional CDS	98%
Opportunities	100%
Project PEDS	100%
Child Development Services Downeast	89%
York County	99%
State Total	98%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

Pursuant to OSEP Memo 14-3, Maine is not required to report on progress/slippage or improvement activities for this indicator for FFY 2012 because the state has met its target.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):

Improvement activities have been reviewed by CDS State IEU and SICC and no changes have been made.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**Indicator 3:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication):

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged

peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d) divided by [# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus [# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e) divided by the total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Target Data and Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

Targets and Actual Data for Part C Infants and Toddlers Exiting in FFY 2012

Summary Statements	Actual FFY 2011 (% of infants and toddlers)	Actual FFY 2012 (% of infants and toddlers)	Target FFY 2012 (% of infants and toddlers)
1. Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited the program below age expectations in	40%	24%	53%

APR Template – Part C (1)

_____ Maine _____
State

Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Formula: $c+d / a+b+c+d$			
2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program. Formula: $d+e / a+b+c+d+e$	50%	37%	41%
1. Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Formula: $c+d / a+b+c+d$	39%	37%	60%
2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program. Formula: $d+e / a+b+c+d+e$	26%	23%	27%
1. Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Formula: $c+d / a+b+c+d$	51%	48%	53%
2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program. Formula: $d+e / a+b+c+d+e$	43%	34%	38%

APR Template – Part C (1)

Maine
State

Progress Data for Part C Infants and Toddlers FFY 2012

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of infants and toddlers	% of infants and toddlers
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	10	29%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	9	26%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	3	9%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3	9%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	10	29%
Total	N= 35	100%
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):	Number of infants and toddlers	% of infants and toddlers
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	11	31%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	8	23%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	8	23%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3	9%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	5	14%
Total	N= 35	100%
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of infants and toddlers	% of infants and toddlers
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	8	23%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	8	23%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	7	20%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	8	23%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	4	11%
Total	N= 35	100%

Data were collected from the State Child Outcome Summary Form (COSF) database for the reporting period of July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013. Data excludes infants and toddlers with service less than six months, those missing entry or exit dates, infants and toddlers with no information about progress at

APR Template – Part C (1)

Maine
State

exit, and situations where entry and exit data generated impossible progress category combinations. Findings are made based on this data.

Public Reporting of FFY 2012 APR data:

Site	Outcome A		Outcome B		Outcome C	
	SS 1	SS 2	SS 1	SS 2	SS 1	SS 2
Aroostook County	25%	33%	17%	17%	33%	17%
CDS Reach	0%	20%	25%	20%	50%	40%
CDS First Step	25%	43%	67%	14%	67%	43%
Two Rivers	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Midcoast Regional CDS	0%	0%	33%	0%	33%	0%
Opportunities	50%	67%	40%	33%	40%	33%
Project PEDS	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Child Development Services Downeast	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
York County	0%	33%	0%	33%	67%	33%
State Total	24%	37%	37%	23%	48%	34%

For all Outcomes (A, B, and C) Summary Statements 1 and 2 the data demonstrates a decrease from FFY 2011 and FFY 2010.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2012:

A variety of activities have occurred at both the State and regional site level to ensure infants and toddlers demonstrate improved outcomes.

Activities initiated or required by the CDS State IEU over the last year included:

- Updated COSF Q&A document and COSF form were distributed to all regional sites.
- Each COSF submitted to the CDS State IEU is reviewed by the Quality Assurance Director when entered into the COSF database. If there are errors the forms are sent back to the case manager to fix.
- In FFY 2013:
 - Training will occur with regional site staff and directors on the COSF, process and submission requirements.
 - Reports will be run every six months to determine which infants and toddlers should have entry and exit COSFs to assist in raising the number of infants and toddlers assessed.
 - Each regional site will be required to identify a Part C and Part B person to coordinate COSFs sent to the CDS State IEU and those that are sent back to the regional site for clarification. Focused training will happen with this group of individuals.
 - After attending the Improving Data, Improving Outcome Conference in September 2013; Maine will access TA to explore incorporating the COSF into the IFSP.

Activities completed by regional sites:

- Case managers are using progress reports to aid in determining if infants and toddlers are making process or not.
- One regional site has the Part C team leader review all of the COSFs prior to sending them to the CDS State IEU.

The CDS State IEU is aware of the slippage. Data demonstrates less children exiting Part C than the actual number of children that exited. The CDS State IEU is in the process of determining how to ensure all children have outcome data submitted upon entry and exit of Part C.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):

APR Template – Part C (1)

_____Maine_____
State

Improvement activities have been reviewed by CDS State IEU and SICC and no changes have been made.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 4: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target		
FFY 2012	<i>A. Know their rights</i>	<i>B. Effectively communicate their children's needs</i>	<i>C. Help their children develop and learn</i>
	91%	91%	91%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

Actual Target Data	FFY 2011 Actual	
<i>A. Know their rights</i>	$[(197) \div (204)] * 100$	97%
<i>B. Effectively communicate their children's needs</i>	$[(198) \div (205)] * 100$	97%
<i>C. Help their children develop and learn</i>	$[(200) \div (205)] * 100$	98%

Data were collected in the spring of 2013. All families of children receiving services through the nine regional sites (Part C and 619) received a parent survey via a telephone call. 868 Part C families were contacted to complete the survey and 207 responded, yielding a response rate of 24%. This response

APR Template – Part C (1)

_____ Maine _____
State

rate is significantly higher than last year’s 8%. In review of the data, the CDS State IEU has determined the response group is representative of the CDS system.

Surveys		
Contact	Responded	%
868	207	24

Public Reporting of FFY2012 APR Data:

Site	A%	B%	C%
Aroostook County	100%	92%	100%
CDS Reach	96%	100%	98%
CDS First Step	97%	95%	100%
Two Rivers	100%	100%	100%
Midcoast Regional CDS	95%	100%	95%
Opportunities	92%	92%	96%
Project PEDS	96%	92%	92%
Child Development Services Downeast	100%	100%	100%
York County	100%	100%	100%
State Total	97%	97%	98%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

Pursuant to OSEP Memo 14-3, Maine is not required to report on progress/slippage or improvement activities for this indicator for FFY 2012 because the state has met its target.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):

Improvement activities have been reviewed by CDS State IEU and SICC and no changes have been made.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to national data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2012	0.82%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

0.70%

Data were collected from the State database (Case-e) for 618 reporting on December 1, 2012 and reported on February 6, 2013.

Public Reporting of FFY 2012 APR Data:

Site	% Pop
Aroostook County	0.60%
CDS Reach	0.76%
CDS First Step	1.30%
Two Rivers	0.38%
Midcoast Regional CDS	0.88%
Opportunities	0.87%
Project PEDS	0.71%
Child Development Services Downeast	0.99%
York County	0.21%
State Total	0.70%

0.70% = [(90 < 1yr) ÷ (12803 <1 pop)] times 100 compare to 1.02%

Calculation

A. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSP from birth to 1 year	90
B. Total population of infants and toddlers from birth to 1 year	12,803
Percentage of infants and toddlers with IFSP from birth to 1 divided by the total population of infants and toddlers from birth to 1 (A/B) x 100	0.70%

The percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs in Maine for FFY 2012 is 0.70%, compared to the national average of 1.02%. Maine did not reach its target of 0.82%, however the FFY 2012 data shows an improvement over the FFY 2011 data of 0.63%.

Previous years' data were:

FFY 2010	0.52%
FFY 2009	0.64%
FFY 2008	0.52%
FFY 2007	0.71%
FFY 2006	0.64%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

Although not meeting the target, the data shows progress over FFY 2011 and the CDS system has done a great deal of work to ensure the community and public are aware of CDS and the procedure for making referrals to CDS.

Activities initiated or required by the CDS State IEU over the last year included:

- Referrals can be made to CDS by phone, fax and as of January 2013 through an online referral form. CDS underwent a website redesign which allows the use of an electronic referral process for persons to make referrals at their convenience. Once a referral is made electronically the Referral Coordinator is notified through email and the referring party receives a confirmation that the referral was made. During the January through June 2013 time period, averages of 12 online referrals were submitted per month.
- The CDS State Referral Coordinator served on the Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders/Drug Affected Babies Task Force (FASD/DAB). FASD/DAB program goals are to increase awareness about and reduce the number of alcohol and illicit drug-exposed pregnancies. The task force is made up of medical professionals, service provider, and social service agency representatives who serve persons affected with an FASD/DAB. The CDS State Referral Coordinator also serves as a member of the Resource Guide subcommittee.
- The Deputy Director continued to serve on the State Agency Panel of the Caring Community Collaborative.
- CDS State IEU and regional site director's met quarterly with the state's Head Start Director's which included conversations regarding Early Head Start.

Activities completed by regional sites:

- Part C brochures, Primary Service Provider handouts and/ or staff bio sheets were mailed or hand delivered to area physicians, child care programs and community providers/ agencies informing them of who and what CDS is and of the child find process in an effort to increase the number of infants and toddlers referred to their regional site.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):

Improvement activities have been reviewed by CDS State IEU and SICC and no changes have been made.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to national data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2012	2.81%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

2.42%

Data were collected from the State database (Case-e) for 618 reporting on December 1, 2012 and reported on February 6, 2013.

Public Reporting of FFY 2012 APR Data:

Site	% Pop
Aroostook County	2.28%
CDS Reach	2.87%
CDS First Step	3.67%
Two Rivers	1.20%
Midcoast Regional CDS	2.82%
Opportunities	2.14%
Project PEDS	2.18%
Child Development Services Downeast	3.40%
York County	1.98%
State Total	2.42%

2.42% = [(953) ÷ (39345) times 100 compare to 2.79%

Calculation

A. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSP from birth to 3	953
B. Total population of infants and toddlers from birth to 3	39,345

APR Template – Part C (1)

Maine
State

Percentage of infants and toddlers with IFSP from birth to 3 divided by the population of infants and toddlers from birth to 3 (A/B) x 100	2.42%
---	-------

The percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs in Maine for FFY 2012 is 2.42%, compared to the national average of 2.79%. While Maine did not reach its target of 2.81%, the State shows consistency since the FFY 2011 year (2.49%).

Previous years' data were:

FFY 2010	2.37%
FFY 2009	2.29%
FFY 2008	2.29%
FFY 2007	2.38%
FFY 2006	2.51%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

Although not meeting the target, the data for this indicator have remained relatively stable since FFY 2011 and the CDS system has done a great deal of work to ensure the community and public are aware of CDS and the procedure for making referrals to CDS.

Activities initiated or required by the CDS State IEU over the last year included:

- Referrals can be made to CDS by phone, fax and as of January 2013 through an online referral form. CDS underwent a website redesign which allows the use of an electronic referral process for persons to make referrals at their convenience. Once a referral is made electronically the Referral Coordinator is notified through email and the referring party receives a confirmation that the referral was made. During the January through June 2013 time period, averages of 12 online referrals were submitted per month.
- The CDS State Referral Coordinator served on the Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders/Drug Affected Babies Task Force (FASD/DAB). FASD/DAB program goals are to increase awareness about and reduce the number of alcohol and illicit drug-exposed pregnancies. The task force is made up of medical professionals, service provider, and social service agency representatives who serve persons affected with an FASD/DAB. The CDS State Referral Coordinator also serves as a member of the Resource Guide subcommittee.
- The Deputy Director continued to serve on the State Agency Panel of the Caring Community Collaborative.
- CDS State IEU and regional site director's met quarterly with the state's Head Start Director's which included conversations regarding Early Head Start.

Activities completed by regional sites:

- Part C brochures, Primary Service Provider handouts and/ or staff bio sheets were mailed or hand delivered to area physicians, child care programs and community providers/ agencies informing them of who and what CDS is and of the child find process in an effort to increase the number of infants and toddlers referred to their regional site.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):

Improvement activities have been reviewed by CDS State IEU and SICC and no changes have been made.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2012	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

89%

Data were collected from the State database (Case-e) for all infants and toddlers for the reporting period of July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013. Findings of noncompliance are made based on this data. 73 infants and toddlers had delays attributed to exceptional family circumstances and have been included in the numerator and denominator for this indicator.

Infants Evaluated and Assessed and provided an Initial IFSP meeting Within Part C's 45-day timeline:

a. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	898
b. Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	1007
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 (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	89%

Reasons for delay	# of infants and toddlers
CDS (no delay reason was given and/or delay was caused by regional site/ staff)	108
Provider	1

Public Reporting of FFY 2012 APR Data:

Site	%
Aroostook County	48%
CDS Reach	83%
CDS First Step	90%
Two Rivers	97%
Midcoast Regional CDS	88%
Opportunities	97%
Project PEDS	98%
Child Development Services Downeast	93%
York County	82%
State Total	89%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2012²:

While Maine did not reach its target, the State has slightly increased the level of compliance since the FFY 2011 year (88%).

Previous years' data were:

FFY 2010	85%
FFY 2009	64.9%
FFY 2008	70%
FFY 2007	91.1%
FFY 2006	91%

Although not yet meeting target, CDS as a system has shown a slight increase ensuring timelines are met for infants and toddlers. A variety of activities have occurred at both the State and regional site level to ensure 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. In addition to the activities listed below, personnel from the CDS State IEU including some regional site staff and the Part C consultant participated in national and state focused TA activities. TA was received from NERRC and NECTAC through webinars, phone conversations, and a review of information posted on websites. Pertinent information was shared with regional site directors via email, at RSLT meetings, or through regional site webinars.

² In an effort to reduce reporting burden, in the FFY 2012 APR, States: 1) Are not required to provide an explanation of: a) progress; b) no change in actual target data from the data for FFY 2011; or c) slippage if the State meets its target. 2) Are not required to discuss improvement activities for: a) compliance indicators where the State reports 100% compliance for FFY 2012; and b) results indicators where the State has met its FFY 2012 target. 3) May provide one set of improvement activities for the entire APR as long as the Improvement Activities are indexed back to reference the relevant indicators.

APR Template – Part C (1)

Activities initiated or required by the CDS State IEU over the last year included:

- CDS State IEU provided compliance reports to regional sites monthly which included all infants and toddlers who were found to not have an evaluation done timely.
- The Maine Part C Professional Development team remained a focus group through FFY 2012 and provided training and clarification on rules, regulations and procedures to CDS Part C teams.
- All regional sites had at least one Part C Early Intervention Team providing evaluations and services using evidence based early intervention model.
- The CDS State IEU developed a mechanism for regional sites to enter into block contracts with individuals to assist in meeting infants and toddlers needs.
- The mandated referral form was revised to include a provider update to ensure the regional site knows if a provider is able to accept a referral for services or not.
- Initiated Corrective Action Plan (CAP) calls at least bimonthly where the Deputy Director and Quality Assurance Director received updates on the progress of each regional site's CAP.

Activities completed by regional sites:

- All regional sites had Part C teams comprised of employees and contracted professionals who conducted initial evaluations.
- Some regional sites have designated staff who scheduled and coordinated their evaluation teams, tracked referrals through to evaluation and who reviewed the data system to ensure information was entered and accurate.
- Compliance reports were reviewed at least monthly at Part C meetings.
- A timeline report for each case manager was issued twice a month and copied to the Part C team leader and regional site director to help monitor timelines. The team leader used this report to notify case managers when resources may need to be shared across geographical Part C teams as appropriate to ensure that evaluation and initial IFSP timelines were met.
- Regional sites reviewed and provided an explanation of all infants and toddlers out of compliance, including the reason the timeline was not met using the monthly compliance report sent by the CDS State IEU.
- One regional site made phone calls to the parent within three days of receipt of the referral. If a home visit was desired, it was scheduled within two weeks of the referral date. If evaluation was warranted, it was scheduled within four weeks of the referral date. Eligibility/IFSP development was scheduled no later than five weeks from the date of referral.
- One regional site made use of a spreadsheet that automatically calculated compliance dates, and was sorted by case manager for ease of access to the needed information.

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2011 for this indicator: 88%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012)	4
2. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	4
3. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2011 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3))	0
---	----------

APR Template – Part C (1)

Maine
State

above)	
5. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
6. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

All findings of noncompliance for FFY 2011 have been timely corrected.

Verification of Correction of FFY 2011 noncompliance (either timely or subsequent):

Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2011 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on 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 regional site, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011:

Specifically, to verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from Case-e, performed on-site file reviews, and verified subsequent data submitted through regional site self-assessments and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The subsequent time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance with the specific regulatory requirements varied based on the level of noncompliance identified in the program.

Through Case-e, CDS was also able to verify that each child received an evaluation, assessment and initial IFSP, although late.

In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, CDS State IEU also complied with the requirements to account for all instances of noncompliance identified through its database as well as on-site monitoring and other monitoring procedures; identify the level, location (regional site), and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any regional site with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit CAPs. CDS State IEU and the regional site created the CAP. These activities ranged from providing staff training, attending required TA, submitting monthly reports to the CDS State IEU and completing CAP check in calls with the CDS State IEU.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

There were no remaining uncorrected FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013, FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator.

1. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013, FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator	0
2. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected	0
3. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Verification of Remaining FFY 2010 findings:

There were no remaining uncorrected FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013, FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010:

There were no remaining uncorrected FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013, FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2009 or Earlier (if applicable):

There were no remaining uncorrected FFY 2009 or Earlier findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013, FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State’s Response
<p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (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 EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	<p>CDS reports on the verification of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 in the “Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance” section above.</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):

Improvement activities have been reviewed by CDS State IEU and SICC and no changes have been made.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Indicator 8A: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning, including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2012	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

99%

Data were collected from the State database (Case-e) for all toddlers for the reporting period of July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013 and verified by each regional site. Findings of noncompliance are made based on this data. 28 toddlers were included in the numerator and denominator based on exceptional family circumstances.

Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning:

a. Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	614
b. Number of children exiting Part C	620
The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the lead agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday. (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	99%

Reason for Delay	Count
CDS (no delay reason was given)	6

and/or delay was caused by regional site/ staff)	
Documented exceptional family circumstance	28

Public Reporting of FFY 2012 APR Data:

Site	%
Aroostook County	100%
CDS Reach	99%
CDS First Step	100%
Two Rivers	98%
Midcoast Regional CDS	99%
Opportunities	100%
Project PEDS	98%
Child Development Services Downeast	100%
York County	99%
State Total	99%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2012³:

Maine did not reach its target for FFY 2012 and has increased from the FFY 2011 year (94%).

Previous years' data were:

FFY 2010	87%
FFY 2009	86.6%
FFY 2008	79%
FFY 2007	83.5%
FFY 2006	69%

Although not yet meeting target, CDS as a system has shown an increase ensuring toddlers exiting Part C have an IFSP with transition steps and services. A variety of activities have occurred at both the State and regional site level to ensure all toddlers exiting Part C received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday, including documented transition steps and services within the IFSP. In addition to the activities listed below, personnel from the CDS State IEU, including some regional site staff and the Part C consultant, participated in national and state focused TA activities. TA was received from NERRC and NECTAC through webinars, phone conversations, and review of information posted on websites. Pertinent information was shared with regional site directors via email and at their RSLT meetings.

Activities initiated or required by the CDS State IEU over the last year included:

- Initiated Corrective Action Plan (CAP) calls at least bimonthly where the Deputy Director and Quality Assurance Director received updates on the progress of each regional site's CAP.

³ In an effort to reduce reporting burden, in the FFY 2012 APR, States: 1) Are not required to provide an explanation of: a) progress; b) no change in actual target data from the data for FFY 2011; or c) slippage if the State meets its target. 2) Are not required to discuss improvement activities for: a) compliance indicators where the State reports 100% compliance for FFY 2012; and b) results indicators where the State has met its FFY 2012 target. 3) May provide one set of improvement activities for the entire APR as long as the Improvement Activities are indexed back to reference the relevant indicators.

APR Template – Part C (1)

Maine
State

- In FFY 2013, the CDS State IEU will provide training on the transition process with Part C and Part B case managers as well as have specific training for Part B IEP transition facilitator. Guidance documents will be provided to all regional sites to assist in clarifying the transition process.

Activities completed by regional sites:

- Case managers ran reports on or were provided spreadsheets listing the toddlers on their caseload who were 2.3 to 2.9 years of age.
- Ongoing meeting were held to educate and refine the Part C to Part B transition process.

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2011 for this indicator: 94%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012)	3
2. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	3
3. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2011 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
6. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

All findings of noncompliance for FFY 2011 have been timely corrected.

Verification of Correction of FFY 2011 noncompliance (either timely or subsequent):

Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2011 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on 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 regional site, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011:

Specifically, to verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from Case-e, performed on-site file reviews, and verified subsequent data submitted through regional site self-assessments and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The subsequent time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100%

compliance with the specific regulatory requirements varied based on the level of noncompliance identified in the program.

Through Case-e, CDS was also able to verify that each child within CDS had an IFSP with transition steps and services if they were still in the jurisdiction of the early intervention program.

In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, CDS State IEU also complied with the requirements to account for all instances of noncompliance identified through its database as well as on-site monitoring and other monitoring procedures; identify the level, location (regional site), and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any regional site with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit CAPs. CDS State IEU and the regional site created the CAP. These activities ranged from providing staff training, attending required TA, submitting monthly reports to the CDS State IEU and completing CAP check in calls with the CDS State IEU.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

There were no remaining uncorrected FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013, FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator.

1. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s July, 1, 2013 FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator	0
2. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected	0
3. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2010 findings:

There were no remaining uncorrected FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013, FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010:

There were no remaining uncorrected FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013, FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2009 or Earlier (if applicable):

There were no remaining uncorrected FFY 2009 or Earlier findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013, FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State’s Response
Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance	CDS reports on the verification of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 in the “Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance” section above.

<p>identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (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 EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	
--	--

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):

Improvement activities have been reviewed by CDS State IEU and SICC and no changes have been made.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Indicator 8B: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for potentially eligible Part B preschool services. (Transition Notification)

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and the LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning, including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2012	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

100%

Data were collected from the State database (Case-e) for all toddlers for the reporting period of July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013. Findings of noncompliance are made based on this data.

Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning (Notification to LEA):

a. Number of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the notification to the LEA occurred	620
b. Number of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	620
The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for potentially eligible Part B preschool services. (Transition Notification) (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	100%

Public Reporting of FFY 2012 APR Data:

APR Template – Part C (1)

Maine
State

Site	%
Aroostook County	100%
CDS Reach	100%
CDS First Step	100%
Two Rivers	100%
Midcoast Regional CDS	100%
Opportunities	100%
Project PEDS	100%
Child Development Services Downeast	100%
York County	100%
State Total	100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2012⁴:

Pursuant to OSEP Memo 14-3, Maine is not required to report on progress/slippage or improvement activities for this indicator for FFY 2012 because the state has met its target.

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2011 for this indicator: 100%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012)	0
2. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	0
3. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2011 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

⁴ In an effort to reduce reporting burden, in the FFY 2012 APR, States: 1) Are not required to provide an explanation of: a) progress; b) no change in actual target data from the data for FFY 2011; or c) slippage if the State meets its target. 2) Are not required to discuss improvement activities for: a) compliance indicators where the State reports 100% compliance for FFY 2012; and b) results indicators where the State has met its FFY 2012 target. 3) May provide one set of improvement activities for the entire APR as long as the Improvement Activities are indexed back to reference the relevant indicators.

APR Template – Part C (1)

There were no FFY 2011 findings of noncompliance.

Verification of Correction of FFY 2011 noncompliance (either timely or subsequent):

There were no FFY 2011 findings of noncompliance.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011:

There were no FFY 2011 findings of noncompliance.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

There were no FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance.

1. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP's July 1, 2013 FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator	0
2. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected	0
3. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2010 findings:

There were no FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010:

There were no FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2009 or Earlier (if applicable):

There were no FFY 2009 or Earlier findings of noncompliance.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
N/A	N/A

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):

Improvement activities have been reviewed by CDS State IEU and SICCC and no changes have been made.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Indicator 8C: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the lead agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning, including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2012	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

83%

Data were collected from the State database (Case-e) for all toddlers for the reporting period of July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013. Findings of noncompliance are made based on this data.

Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning (Transition Conference):

a. Number of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred	514
b. Number of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	620
The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the lead agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services(Transition Conference) (Percent = [(a) divided by (b)] times 100)	83%

Reason for Delay	Count
CDS (no delay reason was given and/or delay was caused by regional site/ staff)	106

Public Reporting of FFY 2012 APR Data:

Site	%
Aroostook County	58%
CDS Reach	88%
CDS First Step	81%
Two Rivers	86%
Midcoast Regional CDS	91%
Opportunities	84%
Project PEDS	89%
Child Development Services Downeast	77%
York County	79%
State Total	83%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2012⁵:

Maine did not reach its target for FFY 2012 and had an increase from FFY 2011 (77%).

Previous years' data were:

FFY 2010	93%
FFY 2009	94.8%
FFY 2008	56%
FFY 2007	60%
FFY 2006	87%

Although not yet meeting target, CDS as a system has shown an increase ensuring toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the lead agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services. A variety of activities have occurred at both the State and regional site level to ensure all toddlers exiting Part C received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday, including having the transition conference for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B at least 90 days but not more than nine months, prior to the toddlers third birthday. In addition to the activities listed below, personnel from the CDS State IEU, including some regional site staff and the Part C consultant, participated in national and state focused TA activities. TA was received from NERRC and NECTAC through webinars, phone conversations, and

⁵ In an effort to reduce reporting burden, in the FFY 2012 APR, States: 1) Are not required to provide an explanation of: a) progress; b) no change in actual target data from the data for FFY 2011; or c) slippage if the State meets its target. 2) Are not required to discuss improvement activities for: a) compliance indicators where the State reports 100% compliance for FFY 2012; and b) results indicators where the State has met its FFY 2012 target. 3) May provide one set of improvement activities for the entire APR as long as the Improvement Activities are indexed back to reference the relevant indicators.

APR Template – Part C (1)

Maine
State

review of information posted on websites. Pertinent information was shared with regional site directors via email and at their RSLT meetings.

Activities initiated or required by the CDS State IEU over the last year included:

- Required all regional sites to have a Part B IEP transition facilitator to assist with streamlining the transition process.
- Initiated Corrective Action Plan (CAP) calls at least bimonthly where the Deputy Director and Quality Assurance Director received updates on the progress of each regional site's CAP.
- In FFY 2013, the CDS State IEU will provide training on the transition process with Part C and Part B case managers as well as have specific training for Part B IEP transition facilitator. Guidance documents will be provided to all regional sites to assist in clarifying the transition process.

Activities completed by regional sites:

- Part C case managers and the regional site Part B IEP transition facilitator met regularly to discuss toddlers who were transitioning after consent to share records was provided by the family.
- Part C case managers and regional site Part B IEP transition facilitator worked together to schedule meetings to ensure a Part B representative was present at the transition conference.
- Case managers were able to run reports on or were provided spreadsheets listing the toddlers on their caseload who were 2.3 to 2.9 years of age. Reports were shared with the Part B IEP transition facilitator.
- Held meetings to educate and refine the Part C to Part B transition process.

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2011 for this indicator: 77%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012)	2
2. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS program of the finding)	2
3. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2011 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

All findings of noncompliance for FFY 2011 have been timely corrected.

Verification of Correction of FFY 2011 noncompliance (either timely or subsequent):

Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2011 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was 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 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 regional site, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011:

Specifically, to verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from Case-e, performed on-site file reviews, and verified subsequent data submitted through regional site self-assessments and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The subsequent time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance with the specific regulatory requirements varied based on the level of noncompliance identified in the program.

Through Case-e, CDS was also able to verify that each child in CDS had a transition conference, although late.

In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, CDS State IEU also complied with the requirements to account for all instances of noncompliance identified through its database as well as on-site monitoring and other monitoring procedures; identify the level, location (regional site), and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any regional site with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit CAPs. CDS State IEU and the regional site created the CAP. These activities ranged from providing staff training, attending required TA, submitting monthly reports to the CDS State IEU and completing CAP check in calls with the CDS State IEU.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

There were no remaining uncorrected FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013, FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator.

1. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s June 2013, FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator	0
2. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected	0
3. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2010 findings:

There were no remaining uncorrected FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013, FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator.

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010:

There were no remaining uncorrected FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013, FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2009 or Earlier (if applicable):

There were no remaining uncorrected FFY 2009 or Earlier findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP’s July 1, 2013, FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State’s Response
<p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (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 EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	<p>CDS reports on the verification of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 in the “Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance” section above.</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):

Improvement activities have been reviewed by CDS State IEU and SICC and no changes have been made.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:
a. # of findings of noncompliance.
b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.
States are required to use the “Indicator C 9 Worksheet” to report data for this indicator (see Attachment 1).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2012</i>	<i>100%</i>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

<i>100%</i>

INDICATOR C-9 WORKSHEET

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 through 6/30/12)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 through 6/30/12)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification

APR Template – Part C (1)

1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	4	4	4
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved outcomes	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			

APR Template – Part C (1)

7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	3	3	3
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
8. The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has: A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	3	3	3
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
8. The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has: B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			

APR Template – Part C (1)

8. The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	2	2	2
C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b		12	12	
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification		(b) / (a) X 100 =	100.00%	

APR Template – Part C (1)

_____ Maine _____
State

= (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.		
--	--	--

Describe the process for selecting EIS programs for Monitoring:

The CDS State IEU monitors all nine regional sites annually on compliance indicators based on APR data.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2012⁶:

Pursuant to OSEP Memo 14-3, Maine is not required to report on progress/slippage or improvement activities for this indicator for FFY 2012 because the state has met its target.

Note: For this indicator, report data on the correction of findings of noncompliance the State identified in FFY 2011 (July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012) and verified as corrected as soon as possible and in no case later than one year from identification.

Timely Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State identified in FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator C9 Worksheet)	12
2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS programs of the finding) (Sum of Column b on the Indicator C9 Worksheet)	12
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance) and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2011 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
6. Number of FFY 2011 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

⁶ In an effort to reduce reporting burden, in the FFY 2012 APR, States: 1) Are not required to provide an explanation of: a) progress; b) no change in actual target data from the data for FFY 2011; or c) slippage if the State meets its target. 2) Are not required to discuss improvement activities for: a) compliance indicators where the State reports 100% compliance for FFY 2012; and b) results indicators where the State has met its FFY 2012 target. 3) May provide one set of improvement activities for the entire APR as long as the Improvement Activities are indexed back to reference the relevant indicators.

Verification of Correction for findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (either timely or subsequent):

Prior to considering any finding from FFY 2011 corrected, CDS State IEU verified that each regional site with noncompliance: (1) was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (IDEA and MUSER) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the regional site, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

Describe the specific actions that the State took to verify the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (including any revisions to general supervision procedures, technical assistance provided and/or any enforcement actions that were taken):

Specifically, to verify that each regional site was correctly implementing the requirements, CDS State IEU reviewed subsequent updated data from Case-e, performed on-site file reviews, and verified subsequent data submitted through regional site self-assessments and compliance reports submitted by each regional site. The subsequent time period for which each program was required to demonstrate 100% compliance with the specific regulatory requirements varied based on the level of noncompliance identified in the program.

For timeline specific requirements, CDS also verified that the action occurred, although late. For other requirements, CDS verified correction for each child if the child was still within jurisdiction of the regional site..

In addition to verifying correction according to the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum, CDS State IEU also complied with the requirements to account for all instances of noncompliance identified through its database as well as on-site monitoring and other monitoring procedures; identify the level, location (regional site), and root cause(s) of all noncompliance; and require any regional site with policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the noncompliance to revise those policies, procedures, or practices and submit CAPs. CDS State IEU and the regional site created the CAP. These activities ranged from providing staff training, attending required TA, submitting monthly reports to the CDS State IEU and completing CAP check in calls with the CDS State IEU.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

All findings of noncompliance for FFY 2011 have been timely corrected.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable)

If the State reported less than 100% for this indicator in its FFY 2011 APR and did not report in the FFY 2011 APR that the remaining FFY 2010 findings were subsequently corrected, provide the information below:

1. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings noted in OSEP's July 1, 2013 FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator	0
2. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected	0
3. Number of remaining FFY 2010 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 or Earlier (if applicable)

There were no remaining uncorrected FFY 2009 or Earlier findings of noncompliance noted in OSEP's July 2013, FFY 2011 APR response table for this indicator.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State’s Response
<p>When reporting in the FFY 2012 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance, the State must report that it verified that each EIS program or provider with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011: (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 EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2012 APR, the State must use and submit the Indicator 9 Worksheet.</p>	<p>CDS reports on the verification of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 in the “Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance” section above.</p>
<p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C in the FFY 2012 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>	<p>Correction of noncompliance for indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C are described in the tables and narrative of those indicators.</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):

Improvement activities have been reviewed by CDS State IEU and SICC and no changes have been made.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 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).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Table 4, Section C

SECTION C: Due Process Complaints	
(3) Total number of due process complaints filed (for all States)	0
(3.1) Resolution meetings (applicable ONLY for States using Part B due process hearing procedures)	0
(a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings	0
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated (for all States) –	0
(a) Complete EITHER item (1) <u>OR</u> item (2), below, as applicable.	
(1) Decisions within timeline – <u>Part C</u> Procedures	“-9”
(2) Decisions within timeline – <u>Part B</u> Procedures	0
(b) Decisions within extended timeline (applicable ONLY if using Part B due process hearing procedures)	0
(3.3) Hearing pending (for all States)	0
(3.4) Due process complaint withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing)(for all States)	0

* The notation “-9” indicates that the data are not reported because the state does not have separate Part C procedures to report. Maine Part C follows the same procedures as Part B.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2012	6%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

No cases were initiated

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

No cases were initiated, so no progress or slippage could be calculated.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):

Improvement activities have been reviewed by CDS State IEU and SICC and no changes have been made.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 13: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

Table 4, Section B

SECTION B: Mediation Requests	
(2) Total number of mediation requests received	1
(2.1) Mediations held	1
(a) Mediations held related to due process complaints	1
(i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	1
(b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints	0
(i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	0
(2.2) Mediations pending	0
(2.3) Mediations not held	0

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2012	85%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

Pursuant to OSEP Memo 14-3, Maine is not required to report on progress/slippage or improvement activities for this indicator for FFY 2012 because the state has met its target.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):

Improvement activities have been reviewed by CDS State IEU and SICC and no changes have been made.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, settings and November 1 for exiting, personnel, dispute resolution); and
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.

As stated in the Indicator Measurement Table, States may, but are not required, to report data for this indicator. OSEP will use the Indicator 14 Rubric to calculate the State’s data for this indicator. States will have an opportunity to review and respond to OSEP’s calculation of the State’s data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2012	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012:

Child Development Services (CDS), pursuant to OSEP Memorandum 14-3 and instruction in the 2014 Part C Indicator Measurement Table, is not reporting data for this indicator for the initial FFY 2012 APR submission by February 3, 2014. CDS will review and respond to OSEP’s calculation of data on this indicator when it is received from OSEP. Discussion of progress/slippage and improvement activities, if required, will be included after the OSEP calculation has been reviewed.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2012:

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):

Improvement activities have been reviewed by CDS State IEU and SICC and no changes have been made.