

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY 2020**

Federated States of Micronesia



PART B DUE February 1, 2022

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

This Executive Summary includes a description of the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2020. A description of FSM's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public are provided separately within this Introduction section of FSM's FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

This FFY 2020 SPP/APR includes new Targets established with input from stakeholders for FFY 2020 to FFY 2025. Targets for Results Indicators 1 to 8 and 14-16 were established, with consideration of rigor and achievability. As required, Targets for Compliance Indicators 11 and 13 are set at 100%. As per OSEP's instructions, the following Indicators do not apply to the FSM: 4B, 9, 10, and 12.

FSM's FFY 2019 APR includes performance for the 11 Results and 2 Compliance Indicators of the 16 SPP Indicator measures that apply to FSM and required explanation of slippage for Indicators that FSM Targets were not met. FSM did not meet all Results indicator targets in FFY 2019. With stakeholder input, FSM will establish new baseline and targets for the FFY 2020 APR results indicators, using performance data reported in previous FFY APRs.

As per OSEP's instructions, for Indicator 17, FSM's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), FSM is submitting its FFY 2020 performance and SSIP Phase III, Year Six, along with the APR Indicators on this submission on February 1, 2022.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

1

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

The Federated States of Micronesia National Department of Education (FSM-NDOE) is the government entity responsible for the general supervision and monitoring, including the identification of noncompliance with the IDEA requirements, to provide special education and related services for children with disabilities. FSM-NDOE is a unitary education system with the delivery of special education and related services implemented within the four FSM island states: Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap. Given FSM's unique geographic context, NDOE has established a general supervision structure similar to a State Education Agency (SEA) and Local Education Agency (LEA) structure for administering, supervising, and monitoring the implementation of the IDEA requirements.

FSM's administrative structure for the implementation of IDEA Part B requirements includes the NDOE as the SEA and the four FSM islands states as the LEAs. NDOE has three organizational divisions, Division of Formal & Non-Formal Education, Division of Quality & Effectiveness, and Division of Special Services. The Division of Special Services is responsible for the implementation of IDEA Part B requirements and have in place its FSM special education procedural manual and notice of procedural safeguards, consistent with the IDEA Part B requirements that were disseminated and implemented in all four LEAs. NDOE also has in place a dispute resolution system that meets the IDEA Part B requirements that were disseminated and implemented in each LEA.

As the SEA, NDOE assures that the IDEA procedural requirements are being met in each LEA. NDOE has developed and implemented a Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) as an ongoing mechanism to assess the impact of special education and related services on improving results for children with disabilities in the FSM. The NDOE monitoring system assesses compliance and performance of each LEA based on IDEA 2004, the Part B regulations, OSEP Memorandum 09-02, and FSM Public Law 14-08 of June 2005. FSM Public Law 14-08 provided the amendments to FSM Public Law 8-21 of 1993 ensuring policy alignment with IDEA. Aligned with OSEP's Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring System (CIFMS), the FSM CIMS includes two processes for identifying compliance and performance of each LEA utilizing the IDEA Part B SPP indicators and measurements and related IDEA requirements: on-site and off-site monitoring. Both on-site and off-site monitoring involves review and verification of correction of non-compliance and continuing adherence to the requirements from the authorities listed above. In addition, FSM's dispute resolution system data, in particular, complaint and due process hearing requests, are reviewed for the identification of noncompliance findings.

Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, for child-specific regulatory noncompliance, demonstration of correction is verified through a review of additional data related to the regulatory citation that demonstrates 100% compliance with the requirement and all child-specific instances of noncompliance verified as corrected. For system noncompliance, evidence of correction of noncompliance includes documentation of revised LEA policies or procedures and/or practices and evidence that such required/recommended policies or procedures and/or practices to be developed, implemented, or revised are in fact implemented. An LEA showing documents or data reports noting correction of noncompliance that are verified will be determined to have corrected noncompliance issued to that respective LEA.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

Given FSM's unique geographic context, NDOE has in place a mechanism to ensure timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to each island state/LEA. NDOE implements a reporting mechanism to identify and prioritize technical assistance and training needs in each LEA through the annual LEA application for IDEA Part B funding, quarterly progress reporting, and periodical leadership meetings, such as SPP/APR and SSIP meetings and NDOE Division of Formal and Non-Formal Education meetings or workshops where issues affecting children with disabilities are discussed. In addition, NDOE and Division of Special Services are actively engaged with international development partners in coordinating and planning of training supports for Early Childhood Special Education teachers at the LEA level.

The LEA application for IDEA Part B funding includes the development and implementation of a Local Performance Plan (LPP) that is aligned to the FSM SPP and developed with stakeholder input. Each LEA has in place a special education advisory council or an inter-agency council that meets the membership requirements of the IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education. The LEA special education advisory council reviews LEA data and performance on the FSM SPP indicator measures and provides input to LEA target setting and development and implementation of improvement activities. The advisory council reviews the LEA quarterly progress reports of LEA performance on indicator targets before submission to NDOE. The LEA targets are aligned to and support meeting FSM's SPP targets. The LEA application also includes a budget that reflects the needed funding support for its prioritized improvement activities under each indicator measure.

During the convenings of the FSM National APR Leadership and the SPP/SSIP Leadership teams, both of which comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA advisory councils, both teams review LEA LPP data and information for technical assistance and training implementation and needs. The teams identify LEA-specific needs and national initiatives for allocating resources. NDOE also serves as the conduit for accessing local, regional, international, and national resources, including OSEP-funded centers, to support the LEA-specific and national technical assistance and training needs.

For this reporting period, the APR and SPP/SSIP Leadership meetings were all held virtually. Although no cases of the corona virus of 2019 were tested positive in the four FSM LEAs, FSM school calendars and schedules were altered beginning March to May 2020 to ensure precautionary measures of social distancing were practiced. However, throughout this reporting period, FSM school calendars were back on regular face-to-face instructions, but with continued pre-cautionary measures still in place to ensure a ready and efficient transition back to an altered schedule in case of an active case of corona virus of 2019 is detected on any one of the LEA. Technical assistance providers from mainland US and Guam assisted to facilitate virtual leadership meetings with LEA stakeholders to discuss priorities and TA deliveries.

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.

Given FSM's unique geographic context, NDOE has mechanisms in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide special education and related services that improve results for children with disabilities. With input from the LEAs, NDOE establishes the minimum professional standards and assessment for the certification of all public school teachers and the content standards and assessment for all students. In addition, Title 40 of the FSM code requires all schools in the FSM to meet required minimum standards and undergo a process of accreditation. The purpose of FSM's accreditation is to ensure all schools provide all students an environment that is conducive to learning, with the ultimate goal to raise the level of student academic performance. This purpose is especially important for effectively providing appropriate services for children with disabilities, as the majority of FSM's children with disabilities are in general education classrooms for most of the school day.

The FSM accreditation process includes a review of six required minimum standards: (1) Leadership; (2) Teacher Performance; (3) Data Management; (4) National Curriculum Standards, Benchmarks and Student Learning Outcomes; (5) School Campus, Classrooms and Facilities; and (6) School Improvement Planning. The review is designed to help schools improve the educational services and opportunities for students, which includes deliberate professional development for improving teacher performance. Each school, inclusive of early childhood education, develops and implements a School Improvement Plan (SIP - Standard #6). The SIP contains a comprehensive set of data on various aspects of the school, including student achievement and attendance, teacher qualifications and professional development, and resource inventories. These data are analyzed to show trends, strengths, and weaknesses, and to prioritize professional development for administrators and teachers to ensure FSM reaches the ultimate goal of raising academic achievement for all students.

FSM's Project LIFT (Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow) is one of FSM's major National Initiatives that supports FSM's accreditation process for improving educational results for children with disabilities, as well as children without disabilities. As FSM's Response to Intervention (RTI) Initiative, Project LIFT has identified pilot schools to develop and implement the RTI framework within their SIP. Project LIFT purposefully plans for teacher and support personnel training, coaching, and resource supports in the pilot schools for student screening and assessment, student progress monitoring, and research based instructional intervention programs for improving literacy skills for children in early childhood education (ECE) through fifth grade.

NDOE, FSM's conduit for accessing local, regional, and national resources, has engaged in several OSEP-funded regional professional development grants to improve the knowledge and skills of service providers working with children with disabilities. The Pacific Assessment Consortium (PAC6) served to support the development and implementation of FSM's Alternate Assessment based on Alternate Achievement Standards (AA-AAS), which included teacher training. The Pacific Consortium for Instructional Materials Accessibility Project (Pacific CIMAP) provided technical support and training for teachers and related service personnel to ensure children with print disabilities have the required timely accessible materials. The Pacific Vision Instruction Project (Pacific VIP), an OSEP personnel preparation grant, is another regional project with the outcome of developing personnel in the area of vision education and orientation and mobility for providing educational services for children with visual impairments. These OSEP-funded grants, to name a few, have had significant impact on FSM's personnel capacity to provide appropriate services for children with disabilities. In 2017, the College of the Marshall Islands partnered with University of Hawaii at Manoa Center on Disabilities Studies to deliver a bachelor's degree training program on Deaf Education and Severe Disabilities. This project is titled Navigating Student Success in the Pacific (NSSP) and 14 FSM scholars enrolled and 13 completed in Spring 2021 with 1 on Dean's List and 6 on Honor's List.

NDOE's two new personnel development projects funded by US DOE OSEP, titled Certificate in Educational Leadership, Policy, and Practice (CELPP) and CURRENT, rolled out in 2020 and 2021, respectively, are intended to improve the skills of teachers and education leaders to better improved results for children with disabilities throughout the FSM school system.

Broad Stakeholder Input:

The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates stakeholder involvement for soliciting broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. Given FSM's administrative structure, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team, comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs and LEA general education administrators, serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development, which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. The FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project LIFT includes other key stakeholders, including Department specialists, schools administrators, teachers, and parents for the development and implementation of Indicator 17: FSM's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

For the development of FSM's FFY 2020 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 6 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On April 12-16, 2021, 2 FSM NDOE Division of Special Services staffs provided onsite technical assistance to Yap State and also conducted a public

hearing on April 13, 2021 on the FFY 2021 OSEP Part B grant application and other program requirements, services, and initiatives. Specific discussion topics and questions from parent and community members during the public hearing include statewide assessment and progress monitoring, IEP and special education services, home services, building and instruction accessibility, teacher certification and quality, certified specialist and off-island referral for diagnosis. The one concern shared by the attendants also is the question of FSM's continued eligibility for IDEA funding beyond 2023, with regards to the US-FSM compact agreement. In attendance were 53 people, which included 42 parents and 11 special education and general education administrators and teachers.

- On April 19-23, 2021, 1 NDOE staff and 2 Pohnpei Special Education administrators conducted a similar technical assistance and public hearing in Kosrae State. The meeting in Kosrae included discussions on the FFY 2021 grant application, and other interest areas such as parent rights, certified specialist in autism and other low-incidence conditions, types of disabilities and what parents should know about them, and IEP and what types of assistive devices can be provided to a child. The meeting in Kosrae consisted of 91 total attendants, of which 34 were parents, 1 state legislator, 3 were IEP students, and 53 service providers (including special education staffs and school principals and administrators). All the parent participants represented all the four main municipalities of Kosrae and the officers of the Kosrae Advisory Council/Interagency Council were also represented at the meeting.

- On April 27-30, 2021, Pohnpei DOE conducted its public hearing and community outreach with assistance of 4 NDOE Special Education staffs. 4 community public outreach meetings were held with a total of 280 participants. On the 27th, Nett and U community meeting was held with 51 parents and 9 service providers. On the 28th, the meeting was held in Madolenihmw municipality with 103 parents and 17 service providers. On the 29th, the meeting was held in Kitti municipality with 46 parents and 11 service providers. On the 30th, the community public hearing was held in Kolonia for Kolonia and Sokehs communities with 38 parents and 5 service providers. Some of the discussion highlights include local laws for children with disabilities, appropriate special education services based on appropriate assessment, complaint and due process, related services, funding of services, and the need for more certified specialists.

- On April 28-30, 2 NDOE staffs support Chuuk DOE SPED to facilitate its public hearing and also to provide technical assistance related to early childhood special education and fiscal. In Chuuk, the public hearing was held on the 30th of April with 28 parents and 43 service providers. In addition to the focus areas on ECSE and fiscal, NDOE staffs assisted Chuuk DOE Special Education in data collection and verification. Topic areas covered during the public hearing were allocation of LEA allotments, services in private schools, statewide assessment and accommodations, appropriate and available services to specific disability categories, transportation and related services, lunch services, if allocable, interagency collaboration, medication and coverage, physical therapy, and resource room service.

- On August 5, 2021, outcomes of LEA public hearings and APR/SSIP reports were summarized and presented to FACSSO. The CAP project (Collaboration Across the Pacific), which is an advanced certification academy in the area of severe disability, and autism in particular, was also presented to FACSSO to get ownership and selection of 2 scholars per state to enroll in this project FSM Special Education is partnering in with University of Hawaii Manoa MCH LEND Program and Center on Disability Studies with San Francisco State University, and the Nika Project.

- On October 18-22, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Chuuk State Special Education program. As usual, the monitoring team met with the Chuuk State Advisory Council (AC) to verify their involvement in planning and executing its advisory role, which include LPP review and development. Also present at the meeting with the Chuuk AC were 3 parents, 6 AC members, and 8 special education staffs. During the monitoring visit, the NDOE team and Chuuk DOE also met with the Chuuk House of Senate Joint Committee of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) and Committee of Judiciary and Governmental Relations (JGR). These meeting opportunities provided insights to NDOE and Chuuk SPED in aligning improvement activities and targets to reflect the concerns and inputs from these stakeholders.

- On October 28, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SSIP meeting with all states and consultants from UOG CEDDERS and Sigma Associates, Inc., to further discuss State Logic Model and the LEA Local Systemic Improvement Plans (LSIP).

- On November 22-26, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Yap State Special Education program. NDOE monitoring team and Yap SPED key staffs met with the Yap Advisory Council and 42 parents and some of the discussion highlights were related to neighboring islands monitoring, the lack of certified or qualified special education teachers and specialists, how the parent survey is administered and access to program information and services. The team also met with the 10th Yap State Legislature to also present special education and related services and answer questions from the legislative members. The outcomes of these meeting also are included in Yap SPED discussions on its LPP/LSIP to ensure that improvement activities and target setting are all based on needs, recommendations, and actual program implementation practices.

- On December 8, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SPP/APR stakeholder meeting with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, and SAI on target setting, data verification, and program implementation practices. The LEA inputs from stakeholders during onsite verification and monitoring visits and public hearings were discussed during this virtual meeting.

- On January 5, 18, and 26, NDOE conducted virtual SPP/APR stakeholders meetings with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, SAI, and NCEO on data verification and target setting for both SEA and LEAs. During these SPP/APR final meetings, Chairmen of AC from some of the states attended and contributed to the discussions on indicator performances and target setting.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Number of Parent Members:

391

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

There are State Advisory Councils in all four states. In one LEA (Kosrae State), the Interagency Council is the council that play the same role of the Advisory Council. The AC in each LEA work closely with the Special Education program in representing parents and their respective communities in planning and advising the program in delivery of services. The AC officers and members are included in the LEA exercises to develop annual Local Performance Plans (LPP) and Local Systemic Improvement Plan (LSIP) which also required the signature of the Chairman or a designated representative on the final plan which include both the LPP and the LSIP. In virtual meetings leading up the final FSM FFY 2020 APR, LEA AC members have been involved in the calls with NDOE and consultants from Guam CEDDERS and SAI in analyzing and setting targets for the SEA as well as each LEA. The AC Chairman also signs the proposed budget for the LEA for the upcoming fiscal year.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

The ongoing activities related to onsite technical assistance and community meetings with parents and other stakeholders during onsite verification and monitoring and public hearings were implemented to increase capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities to improve outcomes of CWD. The parent survey conducted annually as part of the APR Indicator 8 requirement continues to be a source for NDOE to gauge the level of participation and engagement of parents in the process. In addition, the 2 newly funded personnel development projects by OSEP, the Certificate in Educational Leadership, Policy, and Practice (CELPP) and Project CURRENT, incorporates training modules on family/parent engagement to ensure future special education administrators have the skills, knowledge, and competencies to increase the capacity of diverse parent groups to support planning and delivery of meaningful services for children with disabilities.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The mechanisms that exist to support soliciting public input in the process of APR and SSIP are the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS), requiring SEA to conduct one annual onsite verification and monitoring of each LEA and to conduct two off-site monitoring in one year. A focused-onsite verification and monitoring visit may be conducted based on the unique need of a state that has been monitored. Each LEA include AC members in their onsite monitoring to ensure they are aware and can help to confirm services being provided to students, among many other things. Based on the outcomes of the monitoring reports, including the offsite monitoring reports, each LEA, including the parent representatives in the monitoring activities, each LEA will develop its LPP/LSIP. The LEA LPP/LSIP are presented at the APR/SSIP National Leadership meetings scheduled to continue the same process but at the national level, looking at all LEA performances, challenges, success, and establishing the national targets for the following cycle.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

Following the requirements of OSEP, the final FFY 2020 APR/SSIP will be made available to the public after both reports are determined final by OSEP. Electronic copies of the FFY 2020 APR/SSIP will be sent to LEA Directors of Education, Special Education Coordinators, and Advisory Council Chairperson. The reports will then be posted on the NDOE website and the DSS website.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.

The final copy of the approved APR/SSIP will be posted no later than 120 days following FSM's submission of its FFY 2020 APR at www.national.doe.fm (NDOE website) and www.fmsped.org (DSS website: <https://www.fmsped.org/resources/1/7>).

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

OSEP notes that FSM submitted verification that the attachment(s) complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508). However, one or more of the Indicator 17 attachments included in the FSM's FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, FSM must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

The FSM's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the FSM's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised FSM of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required FSM to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed FSM to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. FSM must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which FSM received assistance; and (2) the actions FSM took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

FSM's FFY 2019 SPP/APR and Indicator 17 SSIP Phase III Year 5 report were sent to the four LEAs within the 120 days required after the date of the determination letter. Electronic copies of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR and the Indicator 17 SSIP included as a 508 compliant attachment were also sent to the four LEAs, as well as being posted on <https://www.fmsped.org/resources/1/7> (SPP/APR) and <https://www.fmsped.org/resources/1/9> (FFY 2019 SSIP Phase III Year 5, 508 Compliant).

In reviewing its performances on the Results and Compliance indicators, FSM as the SEA, involved stakeholders from the LEA Leadership Team, which included parents, Advisory Council members, and service providers. FSM prioritized the review of results indicators with zero performance. As a result:

(1) Technical assistance sources from which FSM received assistance included:

OSEP-funded centers such as NCSI, NTACTION, DaSy, and Westat. FSM also continued to work with consultants from Guam CEDDERS, Sigma Associates, Inc., and NCEO to provide direct technical assistance and trainings to the LEA on improvement activities related to results indicators, such as the SSIP and assessment.

(2) Actions FSM took as a result of the technical assistance sources included:

FSM supported each LEA with increasing local personnel capacity for improving educational results of children with disabilities. In addition, FSM NDOE DSS partnered with the College of the Marshall Islands (CMI) and the University of Hawaii Manoa-Center on Disability Studies (UH Manoa CDS) and certified 13 FSM scholars with a baccalaureate degree in Severe Disabilities and Deaf Education. The project was funded by OSEP and was titled Navigating Student Success in the Pacific (NSSP).

FSM NDOE DSS has also partnered with UH Manoa CDS and MCH LEND programs, San Francisco State University, and Nika Project to virtually train 8 special education scholars in the areas of related services, with an emphasis on autism, to support the needs of parents and communities and the growing population of infants and young children identified with autism spectrum disorders (ASD). This project is titled Collaborating Across the Pacific (CAP) Academy Advanced Certification Program beginning Fall 2021 to Spring 2022.

FSM's access to OSEP-funded centers and other collaborative partnerships has supported FSM NDOE's commitment to provide technical assistance and training opportunities to the FSM states/LEAs to improve educational results for children with disabilities.

Intro - OSEP Response

The FSM's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2021 determination letter informed the FSM that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the FSM received assistance; and (2) the actions the FSM took as a result of that technical assistance. The FSM provided the required information.

Intro - Required Actions

The FSM's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In FSM's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised the FSM of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the FSM to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the FSM to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The FMS must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the FSM received assistance; and (2) the actions the FSM took as a result of that technical assistance.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	33.08%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	67.00%	72.00%		34.00%	34.00%
Data	68.85%	73.85%	33.08%	34.78%	39.81%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	50.00%	65.00%	67.00%	67.00%	70.00%	75.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates stakeholder involvement for soliciting broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. Given FSM's administrative structure, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team, comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs and LEA general education administrators, serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development, which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. The FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project LIFT includes other key stakeholders, including Department specialists, schools administrators, teachers, and parents for the development and implementation of Indicator 17: FSM's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

For the development of FSM's FFY 2020 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 6 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On April 12-16, 2021, 2 FSM NDOE Division of Special Services staffs provided onsite technical assistance to Yap State and also conducted a public hearing on April 13, 2021 on the FFY 2021 OSEP Part B grant application and other program requirements, services, and initiatives. Specific discussion topics and questions from parent and community members during the public hearing include statewide assessment and progress monitoring, IEP and special education services, home services, building and instruction accessibility, teacher certification and quality, certified specialist and off-island referral for diagnosis. The one concern shared by the attendants also is the question of FSM's continued eligibility for IDEA funding beyond 2023, with regards to the US-FSM compact agreement. In attendance were 53 people, which included 42 parents and 11 special education and general education administrators and teachers.
- On April 19-23, 2021, 1 NDOE staff and 2 Pohnpei Special Education administrators conducted a similar technical assistance and public hearing in Kosrae State. The meeting in Kosrae included discussions on the FFY 2021 grant application, and other interest areas such as parent rights, certified specialist in autism and other low-incidence conditions, types of disabilities and what parents should know about them, and IEP and what types of assistive devices can be provided to a child. The meeting in Kosrae consisted of 91 total attendants, of which 34 were parents, 1 state legislator, 3 were IEP students, and 53 service providers (including special education staffs and school principals and administrators). All the parent participants represented all the four main municipalities of Kosrae and the officers of the Kosrae Advisory Council/Interagency Council were also represented at the meeting.
- On April 27-30, 2021, Pohnpei DOE conducted its public hearing and community outreach with assistance of 4 NDOE Special Education staffs. 4 community public outreach meetings were held with a total of 280 participants. On the 27th, Nett and U community meeting was held with 51 parents and 9 service providers. On the 28th, the meeting was held in Madolenihmw municipality with 103 parents and 17 service providers. On the 29th, the

meeting was held in Kitti municipality with 46 parents and 11 service providers. On the 30th, it the community public hearing was held in Kolonia for Kolonia and Sokehs communities with 38 parents and 5 service providers. Some of the discussion highlights include local laws for children with disabilities, appropriate special education services based on appropriate assessment, complaint and due process, related services, funding of services, and the need for more certified specialists.

- On April 28-30, 2 NDOE staffs support Chuuk DOE SPED to facilitate its public hearing and also to provide technical assistance related to early childhood special education and fiscal. In Chuuk, the public hearing was held on the 30th of April with 28 parents and 43 service providers. In addition to the focus areas on ECSE and fiscal, NDOE staffs assisted Chuuk DOE Special Education in data collection and verification. Topic areas covered during the public hearing were allocation of LEA allotments, services in private schools, statewide assessment and accommodations, appropriate and available services to specific disability categories, transportation and related services, lunch services, if allocable, interagency collaboration, medication and coverage, physical therapy, and resource room service.
- On August 5, 2021, outcomes of LEA public hearings and APR/SSIP reports were summarized and presented to FACSSO. The CAP project (Collaboration Across the Pacific), which is an advanced certification academy in the area of severe disability, and autism in particular, was also presented to FACSSO to get ownership and selection of 2 scholars per state to enroll in this project FSM Special Education is partnering in with University of Hawaii Manoa MCH LEND Program and Center on Disability Studies with San Francisco State University, and the Nika Project.
- On October 18-22, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Chuuk State Special Education program. As usual, the monitoring team met with the Chuuk State Advisory Council (AC) to verify their involvement in planning and executing its advisory role, which include LPP review and development. Also present at the meeting with the Chuuk AC were 3 parents, 6 AC members, and 8 special education staffs. During the monitoring visit, the NDOE team and Chuuk DOE also met with the Chuuk House of Senate Joint Committee of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) and Committee of Judiciary and Governmental Relations (JGR). These meeting opportunities provided insights to NDOE and Chuuk SPED in aligning improvement activities and targets to reflect the concerns and inputs from these stakeholders.
- On October 28, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SSIP meeting with all states and consultants from UOG CEDDERS and Sigma Associates, Inc., to further discuss State Logic Model and the LEA Local Systemic Improvement Plans (LSIP).
- On November 22-26, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Yap State Special Education program. NDOE monitoring team and Yap SPED key staffs met with the Yap Advisory Council and 42 parents and some of the discussion highlights were related to neighboring islands monitoring, the lack of certified or qualified special education teachers and specialists, how the parent survey is administered and access to program information and services. The team also met with the 10th Yap State Legislature to also present special education and related services and answer questions from the legislative members. The outcomes of these meeting also are included in Yap SPED discussions on its LPP/LSIP to ensure that improvement activities and target setting are all based on needs, recommendations, and actual program implementation practices.
- On December 8, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SPP/APR stakeholder meeting with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, and SAI on target setting, data verification, and program implementation practices. The LEA inputs from stakeholders during onsite verification and monitoring visits and public hearings were discussed during this virtual meeting.
- On January 5, 18, and 26, NDOE conducted virtual SPP/APR stakeholders meetings with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, SAI, and NCEO on data verification and target setting for both SEA and LEAs. During these SPP/APR final meetings, Chairmen of AC from some of the states attended and contributed to the discussions on indicator performances and target setting.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	36
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	2
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	23

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
36	61	39.81%	50.00%	59.02%	Met target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

"Graduation with a high school diploma" is defined in the FSM as the completion of required course credits during high school, with each FSM State establishing the required total number of course credits to complete. The following are the graduation requirements for high school credits for each state: Chuuk = 22 credits; Kosrae = 28 credits; Pohnpei = 23 credits; Yap = 22 credits for Yap High and 24 credits for Yap Outer Island and Yap Neighboring Island Central High Schools. These requirements are consistent for students with and without disabilities.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above?
(yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

The FSM provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	37.70%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	7.00%	5.00%	3.00%	2.00%	2.90%
Data	20.33%	4.14%	14.62%	11.83%	10.47%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	37.70%	35.00%	35.00%	33.00%	30.00%	28.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates stakeholder involvement for soliciting broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. Given FSM's administrative structure, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team, comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs and LEA general education administrators, serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development, which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. The FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project LIFT includes other key stakeholders, including Department specialists, schools administrators, teachers, and parents for the development and implementation of Indicator 17: FSM's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

For the development of FSM's FFY 2020 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 6 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On April 12-16, 2021, 2 FSM NDOE Division of Special Services staffs provided onsite technical assistance to Yap State and also conducted a public hearing on April 13, 2021 on the FFY 2021 OSEP Part B grant application and other program requirements, services, and initiatives. Specific discussion topics and questions from parent and community members during the public hearing include statewide assessment and progress monitoring, IEP and special education services, home services, building and instruction accessibility, teacher certification and quality, certified specialist and off-island referral for diagnosis. The one concern shared by the attendants also is the question of FSM's continued eligibility for IDEA funding beyond 2023, with regards to the US-FSM compact agreement. In attendance were 53 people, which included 42 parents and 11 special education and general education administrators and teachers.
- On April 19-23, 2021, 1 NDOE staff and 2 Pohnpei Special Education administrators conducted a similar technical assistance and public hearing in Kosrae State. The meeting in Kosrae included discussions on the FFY 2021 grant application, and other interest areas such as parent rights, certified specialist in autism and other low-incidence conditions, types of disabilities and what parents should know about them, and IEP and what types of assistive devices can be provided to a child. The meeting in Kosrae consisted of 91 total attendants, of which 34 were parents, 1 state legislator, 3 were IEP students, and 53 service providers (including special education staffs and school principals and administrators). All the parent participants represented all the four main municipalities of Kosrae and the officers of the Kosrae Advisory Council/Interagency Council were also represented at the meeting.
- On April 27-30, 2021, Pohnpei DOE conducted its public hearing and community outreach with assistance of 4 NDOE Special Education staffs. 4 community public outreach meetings were held with a total of 280 participants. On the 27th, Nett and U community meeting was held with 51 parents and 9 service providers. On the 28th, the meeting was held in Madolenihmw municipality with 103 parents and 17 service providers. On the 29th, the meeting was held in Kitti municipality with 46 parents and 11 service providers. On the 30th, the community public hearing was held in Kolonia for Kolonia and Sokehs communities with 38 parents and 5 service providers. Some of the discussion highlights include local laws for children with disabilities, appropriate special education services based on appropriate assessment, complaint and due process, related services, funding of services, and the need for more certified specialists.
- On April 28-30, 2 NDOE staffs support Chuuk DOE SPED to facilitate its public hearing and also to provide technical assistance related to early childhood special education and fiscal. In Chuuk, the public hearing was held on the 30th of April with 28 parents and 43 service providers. In addition to the focus areas on ECSE and fiscal, NDOE staffs assisted Chuuk DOE Special Education in data collection and verification. Topic areas covered during the public hearing were allocation of LEA allotments, services in private schools, statewide assessment and accommodations, appropriate and available services to specific disability categories, transportation and related services, lunch services, if allocable, interagency collaboration, medication and coverage, physical therapy, and resource room service.
- On August 5, 2021, outcomes of LEA public hearings and APR/SSIP reports were summarized and presented to FACSSO. The CAP project (Collaboration Across the Pacific), which is an advanced certification academy in the area of severe disability, and autism in particular, was also presented to FACSSO to get ownership and selection of 2 scholars per state to enroll in this project FSM Special Education is partnering in with University of Hawaii Manoa MCH LEND Program and Center on Disability Studies with San Francisco State University, and the Nika Project.
- On October 18-22, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Chuuk State Special Education program. As usual, the monitoring team met with the Chuuk State Advisory Council (AC) to verify their involvement in planning and executing its advisory role, which include LPP review and development. Also present at the meeting with the Chuuk AC were 3 parents, 6 AC members, and 8 special education staffs. During the monitoring visit, the NDOE team and Chuuk DOE also met with the Chuuk House of Senate Joint Committee of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) and Committee of Judiciary and Governmental Relations (JGR). These meeting opportunities provided insights to NDOE and Chuuk SPED in aligning improvement activities and targets to reflect the concerns and inputs from these stakeholders.
- On October 28, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SSIP meeting with all states and consultants from UOG CEDDERS and Sigma Associates, Inc., to further discuss State Logic Model and the LEA Local Systemic Improvement Plans (LSIP).
- On November 22-26, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Yap State Special Education program. NDOE monitoring team and Yap SPED key staffs met with the Yap Advisory Council and 42 parents and some of the discussion highlights were related to neighboring islands monitoring, the lack of certified or qualified special education teachers and specialists, how the parent survey is administered and access to program information and services. The team also met with the 10th Yap State Legislature to also present special education and related services and answer questions from the legislative members. The outcomes of these meeting also are included in Yap SPED discussions on its LPP/LSIP to ensure that improvement activities and target setting are all based on needs, recommendations, and actual program implementation practices.
- On December 8, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SPP/APR stakeholder meeting with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, and SAI on target setting, data verification, and program implementation practices. The LEA inputs from stakeholders during onsite verification and monitoring visits and public hearings were discussed during this virtual meeting.
- On January 5, 18, and 26, NDOE conducted virtual SPP/APR stakeholders meetings with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, SAI, and NCEO on data verification and target setting for both SEA and LEAs. During these SPP/APR final meetings, Chairmen of AC from some of the states attended and contributed to the discussions on indicator performances and target setting.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	36
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	2

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	23

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
23	61	10.47%	37.70%	37.70%	N/A	N/A

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

FSM's drop-out definition is consistent for youth with IEPs and youth without IEPs. Each FSM State Department of Education has policies and procedures in place for counting those youth with IEPs and youth without IEPs who dropped out.

The definition of 'drop-out' in the FSM school systems for all youth is excessive unexcused absences or self-withdrawal, consistent with the IDEA 618 definition of a drop-out. Each FSM State establishes procedures for self-withdrawal and determination of drop-out based on excessive unexcused absences:

Chuuk State: 15 cumulative unexcused absences in the school year.

Kosrae State: 8 cumulative unexcused absences in the school year.

Pohnpei State: 25 cumulative unexcused absences in the school year.

Yap State: 20 consecutive unexcused absences in the school year.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

The FSM has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The FSM provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 6	2020	61.78%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	79.56%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	48.80%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	60.25%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	79.56%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	48.80%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 6	61.78%	65.00%	65.00%	70.00%	75.00%	80.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	79.56%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	48.80%	50.00%	55.00%	60.00%	65.00%	70.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	60.25%	65.00%	65.00%	70.00%	75.00%	80.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	79.56%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	48.80%	50.00%	55.00%	60.00%	65.00%	70.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates stakeholder involvement for soliciting broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. Given FSM's administrative structure, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team, comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs and LEA general education administrators, serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development, which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. The FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project LIFT includes other key stakeholders, including Department specialists, schools administrators, teachers, and parents for the development and implementation of Indicator 17: FSM's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

For the development of FSM's FFY 2020 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 6 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On April 12-16, 2021, 2 FSM NDOE Division of Special Services staffs provided onsite technical assistance to Yap State and also conducted a public hearing on April 13, 2021 on the FFY 2021 OSEP Part B grant application and other program requirements, services, and initiatives. Specific discussion topics and questions from parent and community members during the public hearing include statewide assessment and progress monitoring, IEP and special education services, home services, building and instruction accessibility, teacher certification and quality, certified specialist and off-island referral for diagnosis. The one concern shared by the attendants also is the question of FSM's continued eligibility for IDEA funding beyond 2023, with regards to the US-FSM compact agreement. In attendance were 53 people, which included 42 parents and 11 special education and general education administrators and teachers.
- On April 19-23, 2021, 1 NDOE staff and 2 Pohnpei Special Education administrators conducted a similar technical assistance and public hearing in Kosrae State. The meeting in Kosrae included discussions on the FFY 2021 grant application, and other interest areas such as parent rights, certified specialist in autism and other low-incidence conditions, types of disabilities and what parents should know about them, and IEP and what types of assistive devices can be provided to a child. The meeting in Kosrae consisted of 91 total attendants, of which 34 were parents, 1 state legislator, 3 were IEP students, and 53 service providers (including special education staffs and school principals and administrators). All the parent participants represented all the four main municipalities of Kosrae and the officers of the Kosrae Advisory Council/Interagency Council were also represented at the meeting.
- On April 27-30, 2021, Pohnpei DOE conducted its public hearing and community outreach with assistance of 4 NDOE Special Education staffs. 4 community public outreach meetings were held with a total of 280 participants. On the 27th, Nett and U community meeting was held with 51 parents and 9 service providers. On the 28th, the meeting was held in Madolenihmw municipality with 103 parents and 17 service providers. On the 29th, the meeting was held in Kitti municipality with 46 parents and 11 service providers. On the 30th, the community public hearing was held in Kolonia for Kolonia and Sokehs communities with 38 parents and 5 service providers. Some of the discussion highlights include local laws for children with disabilities, appropriate special education services based on appropriate assessment, complaint and due process, related services, funding of services, and the need for more certified specialists.
- On April 28-30, 2 NDOE staffs support Chuuk DOE SPED to facilitate its public hearing and also to provide technical assistance related to early childhood special education and fiscal. In Chuuk, the public hearing was held on the 30th of April with 28 parents and 43 service providers. In addition to the focus areas on ECSE and fiscal, NDOE staffs assisted Chuuk DOE Special Education in data collection and verification. Topic areas covered during the public hearing were allocation of LEA allotments, services in private schools, statewide assessment and accommodations, appropriate and available services to specific disability categories, transportation and related services, lunch services, if allocable, interagency collaboration, medication and coverage, physical therapy, and resource room service.
- On August 5, 2021, outcomes of LEA public hearings and APR/SSIP reports were summarized and presented to FACSSO. The CAP project (Collaboration Across the Pacific), which is an advanced certification academy in the area of severe disability, and autism in particular, was also presented to FACSSO to get ownership and selection of 2 scholars per state to enroll in this project. FSM Special Education is partnering in with University of Hawaii Manoa MCH LEND Program and Center on Disability Studies with San Francisco State University, and the Nika Project.
- On October 18-22, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Chuuk State Special Education program. As usual, the monitoring team met with the Chuuk State Advisory Council (AC) to verify their involvement in planning and executing its advisory role, which include LPP review and development. Also present at the meeting with the Chuuk AC were 3 parents, 6 AC members, and 8 special education staffs. During the monitoring visit, the NDOE team and Chuuk DOE also met with the Chuuk House of Senate Joint Committee of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) and Committee of Judiciary and Governmental Relations (JGR). These meeting opportunities provided insights to NDOE and Chuuk SPED in aligning improvement activities and targets to reflect the concerns and inputs from these stakeholders.
- On October 28, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SSIP meeting with all states and consultants from UOG CEDDERS and Sigma Associates, Inc., to further discuss State Logic Model and the LEA Local Systemic Improvement Plans (LSIP).
- On November 22-26, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Yap State Special Education program. NDOE monitoring team and Yap SPED key staffs met with the Yap Advisory Council and 42 parents and some of the discussion highlights were related to neighboring islands monitoring, the lack of certified or qualified special education teachers and specialists, how the parent survey is administered and access to program information and services. The team also met with the 10th Yap State Legislature to also present special education and related services and answer questions from the legislative members. The outcomes of these meeting also are included in Yap SPED discussions on its LPP/LSIP to ensure that improvement activities and target setting are all based on needs, recommendations, and actual program implementation practices.
- On December 8, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SPP/APR stakeholder meeting with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, and SAI on target setting, data verification, and program implementation practices. The LEA inputs from stakeholders during onsite verification and monitoring visits and public hearings were discussed during this virtual meeting.
- On January 5, 18, and 26, NDOE conducted virtual SPP/APR stakeholders meetings with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, SAI, and NCEO on data verification and target setting for both SEA and LEAs. During these SPP/APR final meetings, Chairmen of AC from some of the states attended and contributed to the discussions on indicator performances and target setting.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 6	Grade 8	Grade HS
-------	---------	---------	----------

a. Children with IEPs*	157	137	125
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4	1	3
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	92	104	57
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1	4	1

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	161	137	125
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	3	1	3
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	90	104	57
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	4	4	1

*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 6	97	157		61.78%	61.78%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	109	137		79.56%	79.56%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	61	125		48.80%	48.80%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	97	161		60.25%	60.25%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	109	137		79.56%	79.56%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	61	125		48.80%	48.80%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The FSM has not publicly made available assessment results for students without disabilities. FSM therefore reports assessment results for students with disabilities through its annual APR Indicator 3, which can be located on the following website: <https://www.fsmsped.org/resources/1/7>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

The FSM has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The FSM provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The FSM did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the FSM reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the FSM has not reported the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the FSM or island state levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

3A - Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the FSM's 2022 determination letter, the FSM must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2020, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the FSM that in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the FSM must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2021.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 6	2020	0.00%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	0.00%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	0.00%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	1.08%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	1.90%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	0.00%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 6	0.00%	10.00%	10.00%	20.00%	30.00%	50.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	0.00%	10.00%	10.00%	20.00%	30.00%	50.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	0.00%	10.00%	10.00%	20.00%	30.00%	50.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	1.08%	10.00%	10.00%	20.00%	30.00%	50.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	1.90%	10.00%	10.00%	20.00%	30.00%	50.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	0.00%	10.00%	10.00%	20.00%	30.00%	50.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates stakeholder involvement for soliciting broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. Given FSM's administrative structure, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team, comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs and LEA general education administrators, serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development, which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. The FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project LIFT includes other key stakeholders, including Department specialists, schools administrators, teachers, and parents for the development and implementation of Indicator 17: FSM's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

For the development of FSM's FFY 2020 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 6 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On April 12-16, 2021, 2 FSM NDOE Division of Special Services staffs provided onsite technical assistance to Yap State and also conducted a public

hearing on April 13, 2021 on the FFY 2021 OSEP Part B grant application and other program requirements, services, and initiatives. Specific discussion topics and questions from parent and community members during the public hearing include statewide assessment and progress monitoring, IEP and special education services, home services, building and instruction accessibility, teacher certification and quality, certified specialist and off-island referral for diagnosis. The one concern shared by the attendants also is the question of FSM's continued eligibility for IDEA funding beyond 2023, with regards to the US-FSM compact agreement. In attendance were 53 people, which included 42 parents and 11 special education and general education administrators and teachers.

- On April 19-23, 2021, 1 NDOE staff and 2 Pohnpei Special Education administrators conducted a similar technical assistance and public hearing in Kosrae State. The meeting in Kosrae included discussions on the FFY 2021 grant application, and other interest areas such as parent rights, certified specialist in autism and other low-incidence conditions, types of disabilities and what parents should know about them, and IEP and what types of assistive devices can be provided to a child. The meeting in Kosrae consisted of 91 total attendants, of which 34 were parents, 1 state legislator, 3 were IEP students, and 53 service providers (including special education staffs and school principals and administrators). All the parent participants represented all the four main municipalities of Kosrae and the officers of the Kosrae Advisory Council/Interagency Council were also represented at the meeting.
- On April 27-30, 2021, Pohnpei DOE conducted its public hearing and community outreach with assistance of 4 NDOE Special Education staffs. 4 community public outreach meetings were held with a total of 280 participants. On the 27th, Nett and U community meeting was held with 51 parents and 9 service providers. On the 28th, the meeting was held in Madolenihmw municipality with 103 parents and 17 service providers. On the 29th, the meeting was held in Kitti municipality with 46 parents and 11 service providers. On the 30th, the community public hearing was held in Kolonia for Kolonia and Sokehs communities with 38 parents and 5 service providers. Some of the discussion highlights include local laws for children with disabilities, appropriate special education services based on appropriate assessment, complaint and due process, related services, funding of services, and the need for more certified specialists.
- On April 28-30, 2 NDOE staffs support Chuuk DOE SPED to facilitate its public hearing and also to provide technical assistance related to early childhood special education and fiscal. In Chuuk, the public hearing was held on the 30th of April with 28 parents and 43 service providers. In addition to the focus areas on ECSE and fiscal, NDOE staffs assisted Chuuk DOE Special Education in data collection and verification. Topic areas covered during the public hearing were allocation of LEA allotments, services in private schools, statewide assessment and accommodations, appropriate and available services to specific disability categories, transportation and related services, lunch services, if allocable, interagency collaboration, medication and coverage, physical therapy, and resource room service.
- On August 5, 2021, outcomes of LEA public hearings and APR/SSIP reports were summarized and presented to FACSSO. The CAP project (Collaboration Across the Pacific), which is an advanced certification academy in the area of severe disability, and autism in particular, was also presented to FACSSO to get ownership and selection of 2 scholars per state to enroll in this project FSM Special Education is partnering in with University of Hawaii Manoa MCH LEND Program and Center on Disability Studies with San Francisco State University, and the Nika Project.
- On October 18-22, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Chuuk State Special Education program. As usual, the monitoring team met with the Chuuk State Advisory Council (AC) to verify their involvement in planning and executing its advisory role, which include LPP review and development. Also present at the meeting with the Chuuk AC were 3 parents, 6 AC members, and 8 special education staffs. During the monitoring visit, the NDOE team and Chuuk DOE also met with the Chuuk House of Senate Joint Committee of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) and Committee of Judiciary and Governmental Relations (JGR). These meeting opportunities provided insights to NDOE and Chuuk SPED in aligning improvement activities and targets to reflect the concerns and inputs from these stakeholders.
- On October 28, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SSIP meeting with all states and consultants from UOG CEDDERS and Sigma Associates, Inc., to further discuss State Logic Model and the LEA Local Systemic Improvement Plans (LSIP).
- On November 22-26, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Yap State Special Education program. NDOE monitoring team and Yap SPED key staffs met with the Yap Advisory Council and 42 parents and some of the discussion highlights were related to neighboring islands monitoring, the lack of certified or qualified special education teachers and specialists, how the parent survey is administered and access to program information and services. The team also met with the 10th Yap State Legislature to also present special education and related services and answer questions from the legislative members. The outcomes of these meeting also are included in Yap SPED discussions on its LPP/LSIP to ensure that improvement activities and target setting are all based on needs, recommendations, and actual program implementation practices.
- On December 8, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SPP/APR stakeholder meeting with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, and SAI on target setting, data verification, and program implementation practices. The LEA inputs from stakeholders during onsite verification and monitoring visits and public hearings were discussed during this virtual meeting.
- On January 5, 18, and 26, NDOE conducted virtual SPP/APR stakeholders meetings with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, SAI, and NCEO on data verification and target setting for both SEA and LEAs. During these SPP/APR final meetings, Chairmen of AC from some of the states attended and contributed to the discussions on indicator performances and target setting.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 6	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	96	105	60
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or	0	0	0

above proficient against grade level			
--------------------------------------	--	--	--

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	93	105	60
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	2	0

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 6	0	96		0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	0	105		0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	0	60		0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1	93		1.08%	1.08%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	2	105		1.90%	1.90%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	0	60		0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The FSM has not publicly made available assessment results for students without disabilities. FSM therefore reports assessment results for students with disabilities through its annual APR Indicator 3, which can be located on the following website: <https://www.fsmsped.org/resources/1/7>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

The FSM has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The FSM provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The FSM did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the FSM reported publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the FSM has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on regular assessments at the FSM or island state levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

3B - Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2022 determination letter, the FSM must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2020, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the FSM that in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the FSM must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2021.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = $[(\# \text{ of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment})]$. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 6	2020	0.00%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	0.00%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	0.00%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	0.00%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	0.00%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	0.00%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 6	0.00%	10.00%	10.00%	20.00%	30.00%	50.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	0.00%	10.00%	10.00%	20.00%	30.00%	50.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	0.00%	10.00%	10.00%	20.00%	30.00%	50.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	0.00%	10.00%	10.00%	20.00%	30.00%	50.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	0.00%	10.00%	10.00%	20.00%	30.00%	50.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	0.00%	10.00%	10.00%	20.00%	30.00%	50.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates stakeholder involvement for soliciting broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. Given FSM's administrative structure, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team, comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs and LEA general education administrators, serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development, which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. The FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project LIFT includes other key stakeholders, including Department specialists, schools administrators, teachers, and parents for the development and implementation of Indicator 17: FSM's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

For the development of FSM's FFY 2020 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 6 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On April 12-16, 2021, 2 FSM NDOE Division of Special Services staffs provided onsite technical assistance to Yap State and also conducted a public hearing on April 13, 2021 on the FFY 2021 OSEP Part B grant application and other program requirements, services, and initiatives. Specific discussion topics and questions from parent and community members during the public hearing include statewide assessment and progress monitoring, IEP and special education services, home services, building and instruction accessibility, teacher certification and quality, certified specialist and off-island referral for diagnosis. The one concern shared by the attendants also is the question of FSM's continued eligibility for IDEA funding beyond 2023, with regards to the US-FSM compact agreement. In attendance were 53 people, which included 42 parents and 11 special education and general education administrators and teachers.
- On April 19-23, 2021, 1 NDOE staff and 2 Pohnpei Special Education administrators conducted a similar technical assistance and public hearing in Kosrae State. The meeting in Kosrae included discussions on the FFY 2021 grant application, and other interest areas such as parent rights, certified specialist in autism and other low-incidence conditions, types of disabilities and what parents should know about them, and IEP and what types of assistive devices can be provided to a child. The meeting in Kosrae consisted of 91 total attendants, of which 34 were parents, 1 state legislator, 3 were IEP students, and 53 service providers (including special education staffs and school principals and administrators). All the parent participants represented all the four main municipalities of Kosrae and the officers of the Kosrae Advisory Council/Interagency Council were also represented at the meeting.
- On April 27-30, 2021, Pohnpei DOE conducted its public hearing and community outreach with assistance of 4 NDOE Special Education staffs. 4 community public outreach meetings were held with a total of 280 participants. On the 27th, Nett and U community meeting was held with 51 parents and 9 service providers. On the 28th, the meeting was held in Madolenihmw municipality with 103 parents and 17 service providers. On the 29th, the meeting was held in Kitti municipality with 46 parents and 11 service providers. On the 30th, the community public hearing was held in Kolonia for Kolonia and Sokehs communities with 38 parents and 5 service providers. Some of the discussion highlights include local laws for children with disabilities, appropriate special education services based on appropriate assessment, complaint and due process, related services, funding of services, and the need for more certified specialists.
- On April 28-30, 2 NDOE staffs support Chuuk DOE SPED to facilitate its public hearing and also to provide technical assistance related to early childhood special education and fiscal. In Chuuk, the public hearing was held on the 30th of April with 28 parents and 43 service providers. In addition to the focus areas on ECSE and fiscal, NDOE staffs assisted Chuuk DOE Special Education in data collection and verification. Topic areas covered during the public hearing were allocation of LEA allotments, services in private schools, statewide assessment and accommodations, appropriate and available services to specific disability categories, transportation and related services, lunch services, if allocable, interagency collaboration, medication and coverage, physical therapy, and resource room service.
- On August 5, 2021, outcomes of LEA public hearings and APR/SSIP reports were summarized and presented to FACSSO. The CAP project (Collaboration Across the Pacific), which is an advanced certification academy in the area of severe disability, and autism in particular, was also presented to FACSSO to get ownership and selection of 2 scholars per state to enroll in this project. FSM Special Education is partnering in with University of Hawaii Manoa MCH LEND Program and Center on Disability Studies with San Francisco State University, and the Nika Project.
- On October 18-22, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Chuuk State Special Education program. As usual, the monitoring team met with the Chuuk State Advisory Council (AC) to verify their involvement in planning and executing its advisory role, which include LPP review and development. Also present at the meeting with the Chuuk AC were 3 parents, 6 AC members, and 8 special education staffs. During the monitoring visit, the NDOE team and Chuuk DOE also met with the Chuuk House of Senate Joint Committee of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) and Committee of Judiciary and Governmental Relations (JGR). These meeting opportunities provided insights to NDOE and Chuuk SPED in aligning improvement activities and targets to reflect the concerns and inputs from these stakeholders.
- On October 28, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SSIP meeting with all states and consultants from UOG CEDDERS and Sigma Associates, Inc., to further discuss State Logic Model and the LEA Local Systemic Improvement Plans (LSIP).
- On November 22-26, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Yap State Special Education program. NDOE monitoring team and Yap SPED key staffs met with the Yap Advisory Council and 42 parents and some of the discussion highlights were related to neighboring islands monitoring, the lack of certified or qualified special education teachers and specialists, how the parent survey is administered and access to program information and services. The team also met with the 10th Yap State Legislature to also present special education and related services and answer questions from the legislative members. The outcomes of these meeting also are included in Yap SPED discussions on its LPP/LSIP to ensure that improvement activities and target setting are all based on needs, recommendations, and actual program implementation practices.
- On December 8, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SPP/APR stakeholder meeting with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, and SAI on target setting, data verification, and program implementation practices. The LEA inputs from stakeholders during onsite verification and monitoring visits and public hearings were discussed during this virtual meeting.
- On January 5, 18, and 26, NDOE conducted virtual SPP/APR stakeholders meetings with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, SAI, and NCEO on data verification and target setting for both SEA and LEAs. During these SPP/APR final meetings, Chairmen of AC from some of the states attended and contributed to the discussions on indicator performances and target setting.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 6	Grade 8	Grade HS
-------	---------	---------	----------

a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1	4	1
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	0	0	0

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	4	4	1
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	0	0	0

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 6	0	1		0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	0	4		0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	0	1		0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	0	4		0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	0	4		0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	0	1		0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The FSM has not publicly made available assessment results for students without disabilities. FSM therefore reports assessment results for students with disabilities through its annual APR Indicator 3, which can be located on the following website: <https://www.fsmsped.org/resources/1/7>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

The FSM has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The FSM provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The FSM did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the FSM reported publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the FSM has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the FSM or island state levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

3C - Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the FSM's 2022 determination letter, the FSM must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2020, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the FSM that in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the FSM must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2021.

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 6	2020	47.32
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	44.99
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	55.99
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	40.98
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	38.22
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	26.91

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 6	47.32	47.00	47.00	40.00	30.00	20.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	44.99	45.00	45.00	40.00	30.00	20.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	55.99	55.00	55.00	45.00	35.00	25.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	40.98	47.00	47.00	40.00	30.00	20.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	38.22	45.00	45.00	40.00	30.00	20.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	26.91	55.00	55.00	45.00	35.00	25.00

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates stakeholder involvement for soliciting broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. Given FSM's administrative structure, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team, comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs and LEA general education administrators, serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development, which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. The FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project LIFT includes other key stakeholders, including Department specialists, schools administrators, teachers, and parents for the development and implementation of Indicator 17: FSM's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

For the development of FSM's FFY 2020 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 6 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On April 12-16, 2021, 2 FSM NDOE Division of Special Services staffs provided onsite technical assistance to Yap State and also conducted a public hearing on April 13, 2021 on the FFY 2021 OSEP Part B grant application and other program requirements, services, and initiatives. Specific discussion topics and questions from parent and community members during the public hearing include statewide assessment and progress monitoring, IEP and special education services, home services, building and instruction accessibility, teacher certification and quality, certified specialist and off-island referral for diagnosis. The one concern shared by the attendants also is the question of FSM's continued eligibility for IDEA funding beyond 2023, with regards to the US-FSM compact agreement. In attendance were 53 people, which included 42 parents and 11 special education and general education administrators and teachers.
- On April 19-23, 2021, 1 NDOE staff and 2 Pohnpei Special Education administrators conducted a similar technical assistance and public hearing in Kosrae State. The meeting in Kosrae included discussions on the FFY 2021 grant application, and other interest areas such as parent rights, certified specialist in autism and other low-incidence conditions, types of disabilities and what parents should know about them, and IEP and what types of assistive devices can be provided to a child. The meeting in Kosrae consisted of 91 total attendants, of which 34 were parents, 1 state legislator, 3 were IEP students, and 53 service providers (including special education staffs and school principals and administrators). All the parent participants represented all the four main municipalities of Kosrae and the officers of the Kosrae Advisory Council/Interagency Council were also represented at the meeting.
- On April 27-30, 2021, Pohnpei DOE conducted its public hearing and community outreach with assistance of 4 NDOE Special Education staffs. 4 community public outreach meetings were held with a total of 280 participants. On the 27th, Nett and U community meeting was held with 51 parents and 9 service providers. On the 28th, the meeting was held in Madolenihmw municipality with 103 parents and 17 service providers. On the 29th, the meeting was held in Kitti municipality with 46 parents and 11 service providers. On the 30th, it the community public hearing was held in Kolonia for Kolonia and Sokehs communities with 38 parents and 5 service providers. Some of the discussion highlights include local laws for children with disabilities, appropriate special education services based on appropriate assessment, complaint and due process, related services, funding of services, and the need for more certified specialists.
- On April 28-30, 2 NDOE staffs support Chuuk DOE SPED to facilitate its public hearing and also to provide technical assistance related to early childhood special education and fiscal. In Chuuk, the public hearing was held on the 30th of April with 28 parents and 43 service providers. In addition to the focus areas on ECSE and fiscal, NDOE staffs assisted Chuuk DOE Special Education in data collection and verification. Topic areas covered during the public hearing were allocation of LEA allotments, services in private schools, statewide assessment and accommodations, appropriate and available services to specific disability categories, transportation and related services, lunch services, if allocable, interagency collaboration, medication and coverage, physical therapy, and resource room service.
- On August 5, 2021, outcomes of LEA public hearings and APR/SSIP reports were summarized and presented to FACSSO. The CAP project (Collaboration Across the Pacific), which is an advanced certification academy in the area of severe disability, and autism in particular, was also presented to FACSSO to get ownership and selection of 2 scholars per state to enroll in this project FSM Special Education is partnering in with University of Hawaii Manoa MCH LEND Program and Center on Disability Studies with San Francisco State University, and the Nika Project.
- On October 18-22, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Chuuk State Special Education program. As usual, the monitoring team met with the Chuuk State Advisory Council (AC) to verify their involvement in planning and executing its advisory role, which include LPP review and development. Also present at the meeting with the Chuuk AC were 3 parents, 6 AC members, and 8 special education staffs. During the monitoring visit, the NDOE team and Chuuk DOE also met with the Chuuk House of Senate Joint Committee of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) and Committee of Judiciary and Governmental Relations (JGR). These meeting opportunities provided insights to NDOE and Chuuk SPED in aligning improvement activities and targets to reflect the concerns and inputs from these stakeholders.
- On October 28, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SSIP meeting with all states and consultants from UOG CEDDERS and Sigma Associates, Inc., to further discuss State Logic Model and the LEA Local Systemic Improvement Plans (LSIP).
- On November 22-26, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Yap State Special Education program. NDOE monitoring team and Yap SPED key staffs met with the Yap Advisory Council and 42 parents and some of the discussion highlights were related to neighboring islands monitoring, the lack of certified or qualified special education teachers and specialists, how the parent survey is administered and access to program information and services. The team also met with the 10th Yap State Legislature to also present special education and related services and answer questions from the legislative members. The outcomes of these meeting also are included in Yap SPED discussions on its LPP/LSIP to ensure that improvement activities and target setting are all based on needs, recommendations, and actual program implementation practices.
- On December 8, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SPP/APR stakeholder meeting with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, and SAI on target setting, data verification, and program implementation practices. The LEA inputs from stakeholders during onsite verification and monitoring visits and public hearings were discussed during this virtual meeting.
- On January 5, 18, and 26, NDOE conducted virtual SPP/APR stakeholders meetings with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, SAI, and NCEO on data verification and target setting for both SEA and LEAs. During these SPP/APR final meetings, Chairmen of AC from some of the states attended and contributed to the discussions on indicator performances and target setting.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 6	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,663	1,467	1,236
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	96	105	60

c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	787	660	692
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,769	1,463	2,460
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	93	105	60
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	743	585	662
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	2	0
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	2	0

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 6	0.00%	47.32%		47.32	47.32	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	0.00%	44.99%		44.99	44.99	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	0.00%	55.99%		55.99	55.99	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1.08%	42.06%		40.98	40.98	N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8	1.90%	40.12%		38.22	38.22	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	0.00%	26.91%		26.91	26.91	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

The FSM has established the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that baseline.

The FSM provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable).

If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target ≤	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates stakeholder involvement for soliciting broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. Given FSM's administrative structure, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team, comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs and LEA general education administrators, serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development, which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. The FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project LIFT includes other key stakeholders, including Department specialists, schools administrators, teachers, and parents for the development and implementation of Indicator 17: FSM's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

For the development of FSM's FFY 2020 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 6 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On April 12-16, 2021, 2 FSM NDOE Division of Special Services staffs provided onsite technical assistance to Yap State and also conducted a public hearing on April 13, 2021 on the FFY 2021 OSEP Part B grant application and other program requirements, services, and initiatives. Specific discussion topics and questions from parent and community members during the public hearing include statewide assessment and progress monitoring, IEP and special education services, home services, building and instruction accessibility, teacher certification and quality, certified specialist and off-island referral for diagnosis. The one concern shared by the attendants also is the question of FSM's continued eligibility for IDEA funding beyond 2023, with regards to the US-FSM compact agreement. In attendance were 53 people, which included 42 parents and 11 special education and general education administrators and teachers.
- On April 19-23, 2021, 1 NDOE staff and 2 Pohnpei Special Education administrators conducted a similar technical assistance and public hearing in Kosrae State. The meeting in Kosrae included discussions on the FFY 2021 grant application, and other interest areas such as parent rights, certified specialist in autism and other low-incidence conditions, types of disabilities and what parents should know about them, and IEP and what types of assistive devices can be provided to a child. The meeting in Kosrae consisted of 91 total attendants, of which 34 were parents, 1 state legislator, 3 were IEP students, and 53 service providers (including special education staffs and school principals and administrators). All the parent participants represented all the four main municipalities of Kosrae and the officers of the Kosrae Advisory Council/Interagency Council were also represented at the meeting.
- On April 27-30, 2021, Pohnpei DOE conducted its public hearing and community outreach with assistance of 4 NDOE Special Education staffs. 4 community public outreach meetings were held with a total of 280 participants. On the 27th, Nett and U community meeting was held with 51 parents and 9 service providers. On the 28th, the meeting was held in Madolenihmw municipality with 103 parents and 17 service providers. On the 29th, the meeting was held in Kitti municipality with 46 parents and 11 service providers. On the 30th, the community public hearing was held in Kolonia for Kolonia and Sokehs communities with 38 parents and 5 service providers. Some of the discussion highlights include local laws for children with disabilities, appropriate special education services based on appropriate assessment, complaint and due process, related services, funding of services, and the need for more certified specialists.
- On April 28-30, 2 NDOE staffs support Chuuk DOE SPED to facilitate its public hearing and also to provide technical assistance related to early childhood special education and fiscal. In Chuuk, the public hearing was held on the 30th of April with 28 parents and 43 service providers. In addition to the focus areas on ECSE and fiscal, NDOE staffs assisted Chuuk DOE Special Education in data collection and verification. Topic areas covered during the public hearing were allocation of LEA allotments, services in private schools, statewide assessment and accommodations, appropriate and available services to specific disability categories, transportation and related services, lunch services, if allocable, interagency collaboration, medication and coverage, physical therapy, and resource room service.
- On August 5, 2021, outcomes of LEA public hearings and APR/SSIP reports were summarized and presented to FACSSO. The CAP project (Collaboration Across the Pacific), which is an advanced certification academy in the area of severe disability, and autism in particular, was also presented to FACSSO to get ownership and selection of 2 scholars per state to enroll in this project. FSM Special Education is partnering in with University of Hawaii Manoa MCH LEND Program and Center on Disability Studies with San Francisco State University, and the Nika Project.
- On October 18-22, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Chuuk State Special Education program. As usual, the monitoring team met with the Chuuk State Advisory Council (AC) to verify their involvement in planning and executing its advisory role, which include LPP review and development. Also present at the meeting with the Chuuk AC were 3 parents, 6 AC members, and 8 special education staffs. During the monitoring visit, the NDOE team and Chuuk DOE also met with the Chuuk House of Senate Joint Committee of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) and Committee of Judiciary and Governmental Relations (JGR). These meeting opportunities provided insights to NDOE and Chuuk SPED in aligning improvement activities and targets to reflect the concerns and inputs from these stakeholders.
- On October 28, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SSIP meeting with all states and consultants from UOG CEDDERS and Sigma Associates, Inc., to further discuss State Logic Model and the LEA Local Systemic Improvement Plans (LSIP).
- On November 22-26, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Yap State Special Education program. NDOE monitoring team and Yap SPED key staffs met with the Yap Advisory Council and 42 parents and some of the discussion highlights were related to neighboring islands monitoring, the lack of certified or qualified special education teachers and specialists, how the parent survey is administered and access to program information and services. The team also met with the 10th Yap State Legislature to also present special education and related services and answer questions from the legislative members. The outcomes of these meeting also are included in Yap SPED discussions on its LPP/LSIP to ensure that improvement activities and target setting are all based on needs, recommendations, and actual program implementation practices.
- On December 8, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SPP/APR stakeholder meeting with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, and SAI on target setting, data verification, and program implementation practices. The LEA inputs from stakeholders during onsite verification and monitoring visits and public hearings were discussed during this virtual meeting.
- On January 5, 18, and 26, NDOE conducted virtual SPP/APR stakeholders meetings with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, SAI, and NCEO on data verification and target setting for both SEA and LEAs. During these SPP/APR final meetings, Chairmen of AC from some of the states attended and contributed to the discussions on indicator performances and target setting.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

NO

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs in the State	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The Federated States of Micronesia, National Department of Education (FSM NDOE) is a unitary education system with the delivery of special education and related services implemented in the four FSM island states: Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap. Given FSM's unique geographic context, NDOE has established a general supervision structure similar to a State Education Agency (SEA) and Local Education Agency (LEA) structure for administering, supervising, and monitoring the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requirements. NDOE serves as the SEA responsible for the general supervision of special education and related services delivered in the four island states through their Department of Education, which serve as the LEAs. FSM is therefore using the 4A calculation methodology of comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among the four LEAs in FSM; while still reporting FSM as a unitary system - one district.

FSM's definition of "significant discrepancy" is a 2% difference between the four island states or LEAs. This is calculated by determining each LEA's rate and then analyzing the rates to determine if any LEA's rate is 2% more than the lowest LEA rate. A review of the data from year to year will provide additional information for revising, if needed, FSM's "significant discrepancy" definition. This annual review will be conducted because FSM has been reporting in previous years "0" suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for children with disabilities.

Following the one-year lag data for FFY 2020, in 2019-2020, FSM reported "1" long-term suspension/expulsion greater than 10 days in its 618 Discipline data report for one FSM state/LEA. The percentage calculated for this LEA was 0.72% (1/139). The other three LEAs did not report any long-term suspension/expulsion greater than 10 days. The difference between the LEAs therefore did not exceed the 2% "significant discrepancy" rate definition.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

The FSM provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

Per OSEP's instructions, Indicator 4B does not apply to FSM.

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80\% or more of the day)}}{\text{(total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40\% of the day)}}{\text{(total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements)}}{\text{(total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6. Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2020	Target >=	92.50%	92.75%	93.00%	93.50%	93.50%
A	92.22%	Data	94.41%	95.00%	93.72%	94.20%	91.87%
B	2020	Target <=	1.70%	1.20%	1.00%	0.00%	0.00%
B	0.12%	Data	0.31%	0.32%	0.35%	0.24%	0.25%
C	2020	Target <=	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%
C	4.80%	Data	3.66%	3.89%	5.24%	5.03%	5.11%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	92.22%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	90.00%	92.75%
Target B <=	0.12%	0.12%	0.12%	0.11%	0.11%	0.10%
Target C <=	4.80%	4.50%	4.20%	3.90%	3.60%	3.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates stakeholder involvement for soliciting broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. Given FSM's administrative structure, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team, comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs and LEA general education administrators, serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development, which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. The FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project LIFT includes other key stakeholders, including Department specialists, schools administrators, teachers, and parents for the development and implementation of Indicator 17: FSM's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

For the development of FSM's FFY 2020 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 6 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On April 12-16, 2021, 2 FSM NDOE Division of Special Services staffs provided onsite technical assistance to Yap State and also conducted a public hearing on April 13, 2021 on the FFY 2021 OSEP Part B grant application and other program requirements, services, and initiatives. Specific discussion topics and questions from parent and community members during the public hearing include statewide assessment and progress monitoring, IEP and special education services, home services, building and instruction accessibility, teacher certification and quality, certified specialist and off-island referral for diagnosis. The one concern shared by the attendants also is the question of FSM's continued eligibility for IDEA funding beyond 2023, with regards to the US-FSM compact agreement. In attendance were 53 people, which included 42 parents and 11 special education and general education

administrators and teachers.

- On April 19-23, 2021, 1 NDOE staff and 2 Pohnpei Special Education administrators conducted a similar technical assistance and public hearing in Kosrae State. The meeting in Kosrae included discussions on the FFY 2021 grant application, and other interest areas such as parent rights, certified specialist in autism and other low-incidence conditions, types of disabilities and what parents should know about them, and IEP and what types of assistive devices can be provided to a child. The meeting in Kosrae consisted of 91 total attendants, of which 34 were parents, 1 state legislator, 3 were IEP students, and 53 service providers (including special education staffs and school principals and administrators). All the parent participants represented all the four main municipalities of Kosrae and the officers of the Kosrae Advisory Council/Interagency Council were also represented at the meeting.
- On April 27-30, 2021, Pohnpei DOE conducted its public hearing and community outreach with assistance of 4 NDOE Special Education staffs. 4 community public outreach meetings were held with a total of 280 participants. On the 27th, Nett and U community meeting was held with 51 parents and 9 service providers. On the 28th, the meeting was held in Madolenihmw municipality with 103 parents and 17 service providers. On the 29th, the meeting was held in Kitti municipality with 46 parents and 11 service providers. On the 30th, it the community public hearing was held in Kolonia for Kolonia and Sokehs communities with 38 parents and 5 service providers. Some of the discussion highlights include local laws for children with disabilities, appropriate special education services based on appropriate assessment, complaint and due process, related services, funding of services, and the need for more certified specialists.
- On April 28-30, 2 NDOE staffs support Chuuk DOE SPED to facilitate its public hearing and also to provide technical assistance related to early childhood special education and fiscal. In Chuuk, the public hearing was held on the 30th of April with 28 parents and 43 service providers. In addition to the focus areas on ECSE and fiscal, NDOE staffs assisted Chuuk DOE Special Education in data collection and verification. Topic areas covered during the public hearing were allocation of LEA allotments, services in private schools, statewide assessment and accommodations, appropriate and available services to specific disability categories, transportation and related services, lunch services, if allocable, interagency collaboration, medication and coverage, physical therapy, and resource room service.
- On August 5, 2021, outcomes of LEA public hearings and APR/SSIP reports were summarized and presented to FACSSO. The CAP project (Collaboration Across the Pacific), which is an advanced certification academy in the area of severe disability, and autism in particular, was also presented to FACSSO to get ownership and selection of 2 scholars per state to enroll in this project FSM Special Education is partnering in with University of Hawaii Manoa MCH LEND Program and Center on Disability Studies with San Francisco State University, and the Nika Project.
- On October 18-22, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Chuuk State Special Education program. As usual, the monitoring team met with the Chuuk State Advisory Council (AC) to verify their involvement in planning and executing its advisory role, which include LPP review and development. Also present at the meeting with the Chuuk AC were 3 parents, 6 AC members, and 8 special education staffs. During the monitoring visit, the NDOE team and Chuuk DOE also met with the Chuuk House of Senate Joint Committee of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) and Committee of Judiciary and Governmental Relations (JGR). These meeting opportunities provided insights to NDOE and Chuuk SPED in aligning improvement activities and targets to reflect the concerns and inputs from these stakeholders.
- On October 28, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SSIP meeting with all states and consultants from UOG CEDDERS and Sigma Associates, Inc., to further discuss State Logic Model and the LEA Local Systemic Improvement Plans (LSIP).
- On November 22-26, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Yap State Special Education program. NDOE monitoring team and Yap SPED key staffs met with the Yap Advisory Council and 42 parents and some of the discussion highlights were related to neighboring islands monitoring, the lack of certified or qualified special education teachers and specialists, how the parent survey is administered and access to program information and services. The team also met with the 10th Yap State Legislature to also present special education and related services and answer questions from the legislative members. The outcomes of these meeting also are included in Yap SPED discussions on its LPP/LSIP to ensure that improvement activities and target setting are all based on needs, recommendations, and actual program implementation practices.
- On December 8, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SPP/APR stakeholder meeting with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, and SAI on target setting, data verification, and program implementation practices. The LEA inputs from stakeholders during onsite verification and monitoring visits and public hearings were discussed during this virtual meeting.
- On January 5, 18, and 26, NDOE conducted virtual SPP/APR stakeholders meetings with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, SAI, and NCEO on data verification and target setting for both SEA and LEAs. During these SPP/APR final meetings, Chairmen of AC from some of the states attended and contributed to the discussions on indicator performances and target setting.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	1,709
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	1,576
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	4
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	0

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	78

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	1,576	1,709	91.87%	92.22%	92.22%	N/A	N/A
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2	1,709	0.25%	0.12%	0.12%	N/A	N/A
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	82	1,709	5.11%	4.80%	4.80%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

The FSM has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The FSM provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	80.00%	85.00%	88.00%	90.00%	90.00%
A	Data	67.67%	82.39%	81.90%	81.94%	84.73%
B	Target <=	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%	0.60%	0.60%
B	Data	2.26%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates stakeholder involvement for soliciting broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. Given FSM's administrative structure, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team, comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs and LEA general education administrators, serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development, which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. The FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project LIFT includes other key stakeholders, including Department specialists, schools administrators, teachers, and parents for the development and implementation of Indicator 17: FSM's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

For the development of FSM's FFY 2020 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 6 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On April 12-16, 2021, 2 FSM NDOE Division of Special Services staffs provided onsite technical assistance to Yap State and also conducted a public hearing on April 13, 2021 on the FFY 2021 OSEP Part B grant application and other program requirements, services, and initiatives. Specific discussion topics and questions from parent and community members during the public hearing include statewide assessment and progress monitoring, IEP and special education services, home services, building and instruction accessibility, teacher certification and quality, certified specialist and off-island referral for diagnosis. The one concern shared by the attendants also is the question of FSM's continued eligibility for IDEA funding beyond 2023, with regards to the US-FSM compact agreement. In attendance were 53 people, which included 42 parents and 11 special education and general education administrators and teachers.

- On April 19-23, 2021, 1 NDOE staff and 2 Pohnpei Special Education administrators conducted a similar technical assistance and public hearing in Kosrae State. The meeting in Kosrae included discussions on the FFY 2021 grant application, and other interest areas such as parent rights, certified specialist in autism and other low-incidence conditions, types of disabilities and what parents should know about them, and IEP and what types of assistive devices can be provided to a child. The meeting in Kosrae consisted of 91 total attendants, of which 34 were parents, 1 state legislator, 3 were IEP students, and 53 service providers (including special education staffs and school principals and administrators). All the parent participants represented all the four main municipalities of Kosrae and the officers of the Kosrae Advisory Council/Interagency Council were also represented at the meeting.
- On April 27-30, 2021, Pohnpei DOE conducted its public hearing and community outreach with assistance of 4 NDOE Special Education staffs. 4 community public outreach meetings were held with a total of 280 participants. On the 27th, Nett and U community meeting was held with 51 parents and 9 service providers. On the 28th, the meeting was held in Madolenihmw municipality with 103 parents and 17 service providers. On the 29th, the meeting was held in Kitti municipality with 46 parents and 11 service providers. On the 30th, the community public hearing was held in Kolonia for Kolonia and Sokehs communities with 38 parents and 5 service providers. Some of the discussion highlights include local laws for children with disabilities, appropriate special education services based on appropriate assessment, complaint and due process, related services, funding of services, and the need for more certified specialists.
- On April 28-30, 2 NDOE staffs support Chuuk DOE SPED to facilitate its public hearing and also to provide technical assistance related to early childhood special education and fiscal. In Chuuk, the public hearing was held on the 30th of April with 28 parents and 43 service providers. In addition to the focus areas on ECSE and fiscal, NDOE staffs assisted Chuuk DOE Special Education in data collection and verification. Topic areas covered during the public hearing were allocation of LEA allotments, services in private schools, statewide assessment and accommodations, appropriate and available services to specific disability categories, transportation and related services, lunch services, if allocable, interagency collaboration, medication and coverage, physical therapy, and resource room service.
- On August 5, 2021, outcomes of LEA public hearings and APR/SSIP reports were summarized and presented to FACSSO. The CAP project (Collaboration Across the Pacific), which is an advanced certification academy in the area of severe disability, and autism in particular, was also presented to FACSSO to get ownership and selection of 2 scholars per state to enroll in this project FSM Special Education is partnering in with University of Hawaii Manoa MCH LEND Program and Center on Disability Studies with San Francisco State University, and the Nika Project.
- On October 18-22, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Chuuk State Special Education program. As usual, the monitoring team met with the Chuuk State Advisory Council (AC) to verify their involvement in planning and executing its advisory role, which include LPP review and development. Also present at the meeting with the Chuuk AC were 3 parents, 6 AC members, and 8 special education staffs. During the monitoring visit, the NDOE team and Chuuk DOE also met with the Chuuk House of Senate Joint Committee of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) and Committee of Judiciary and Governmental Relations (JGR). These meeting opportunities provided insights to NDOE and Chuuk SPED in aligning improvement activities and targets to reflect the concerns and inputs from these stakeholders.
- On October 28, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SSIP meeting with all states and consultants from UOG CEDDERS and Sigma Associates, Inc., to further discuss State Logic Model and the LEA Local Systemic Improvement Plans (LSIP).
- On November 22-26, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Yap State Special Education program. NDOE monitoring team and Yap SPED key staffs met with the Yap Advisory Council and 42 parents and some of the discussion highlights were related to neighboring islands monitoring, the lack of certified or qualified special education teachers and specialists, how the parent survey is administered and access to program information and services. The team also met with the 10th Yap State Legislature to also present special education and related services and answer questions from the legislative members. The outcomes of these meeting also are included in Yap SPED discussions on its LPP/LSIP to ensure that improvement activities and target setting are all based on needs, recommendations, and actual program implementation practices.
- On December 8, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SPP/APR stakeholder meeting with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, and SAI on target setting, data verification, and program implementation practices. The LEA inputs from stakeholders during onsite verification and monitoring visits and public hearings were discussed during this virtual meeting.
- On January 5, 18, and 26, NDOE conducted virtual SPP/APR stakeholders meetings with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, SAI, and NCEO on data verification and target setting for both SEA and LEAs. During these SPP/APR final meetings, Chairmen of AC from some of the states attended and contributed to the discussions on indicator performances and target setting.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	44.00%
B	2020	0.00%
C	2020	56.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	44.00%	46.00%	48.00%	50.00%	52.00%	54.00%
Target B <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	56.00%	54.00%	52.00%	50.00%	48.00%	46.00%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	6	11	8	25
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3	7	1	11
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	0	0	0	0
b2. Number of children attending separate school	0	0	0	0
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	3	4	7	14

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	11	25	84.73%	44.00%	44.00%	N/A	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	0	25	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
C. Home	14	25		56.00%	56.00%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The FSM has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The FSM provided targets for FFYs 2021 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

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

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

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

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2008	Target >=	83.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	87.00%
A1	79.50%	Data	80.60%	89.86%	100.00%	96.55%	100.00%
A2	2008	Target >=	71.00%	71.00%	71.00%	71.00%	71.00%

A2	65.00%	Data	54.88%	78.75%	79.31%	59.38%	84.85%
B1	2008	Target >=	78.25%	78.50%	78.50%	80.25%	90.00%
B1	80.00%	Data	85.53%	92.11%	96.55%	96.88%	98.33%
B2	2008	Target >=	63.00%	64.00%	65.00%	65.25%	65.25%
B2	65.00%	Data	51.22%	65.00%	58.62%	50.00%	75.76%
C1	2008	Target >=	86.00%	86.00%	87.00%	87.25%	90.00%
C1	87.00%	Data	86.57%	91.78%	92.86%	100.00%	98.41%
C2	2008	Target >=	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%
C2	68.30%	Data	59.76%	68.75%	62.07%	59.38%	80.30%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	80.00%	80.00%	85.00%	85.00%	87.00%	87.00%
Target A2 >=	65.00%	67.00%	69.00%	71.00%	73.00%	75.00%
Target B1 >=	80.00%	80.00%	85.00%	85.00%	87.00%	87.00%
Target B2 >=	65.00%	67.00%	69.00%	71.00%	73.00%	75.00%
Target C1 >=	80.00%	80.00%	85.00%	85.00%	87.00%	88.00%
Target C2 >=	65.00%	67.00%	69.00%	71.00%	73.00%	75.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates stakeholder involvement for soliciting broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. Given FSM's administrative structure, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team, comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs and LEA general education administrators, serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development, which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. The FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project LIFT includes other key stakeholders, including Department specialists, schools administrators, teachers, and parents for the development and implementation of Indicator 17: FSM's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

For the development of FSM's FFY 2020 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 6 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On April 12-16, 2021, 2 FSM NDOE Division of Special Services staffs provided onsite technical assistance to Yap State and also conducted a public hearing on April 13, 2021 on the FFY 2021 OSEP Part B grant application and other program requirements, services, and initiatives. Specific discussion topics and questions from parent and community members during the public hearing include statewide assessment and progress monitoring, IEP and special education services, home services, building and instruction accessibility, teacher certification and quality, certified specialist and off-island referral for diagnosis. The one concern shared by the attendants also is the question of FSM's continued eligibility for IDEA funding beyond 2023, with regards to the US-FSM compact agreement. In attendance were 53 people, which included 42 parents and 11 special education and general education administrators and teachers.
- On April 19-23, 2021, 1 NDOE staff and 2 Pohnpei Special Education administrators conducted a similar technical assistance and public hearing in Kosrae State. The meeting in Kosrae included discussions on the FFY 2021 grant application, and other interest areas such as parent rights, certified specialist in autism and other low-incidence conditions, types of disabilities and what parents should know about them, and IEP and what types of assistive devices can be provided to a child. The meeting in Kosrae consisted of 91 total attendants, of which 34 were parents, 1 state legislator, 3 were IEP students, and 53 service providers (including special education staffs and school principals and administrators). All the parent participants represented all the four main municipalities of Kosrae and the officers of the Kosrae Advisory Council/Interagency Council were also represented at the meeting.
- On April 27-30, 2021, Pohnpei DOE conducted its public hearing and community outreach with assistance of 4 NDOE Special Education staffs. 4 community public outreach meetings were held with a total of 280 participants. On the 27th, Nett and U community meeting was held with 51 parents and 9 service providers. On the 28th, the meeting was held in Madolenihmw municipality with 103 parents and 17 service providers. On the 29th, the meeting was held in Kitti municipality with 46 parents and 11 service providers. On the 30th, it the community public hearing was held in Kolonia for Kolonia and Sokehs communities with 38 parents and 5 service providers. Some of the discussion highlights include local laws for children with disabilities, appropriate special education services based on appropriate assessment, complaint and due process, related services, funding of services, and the need for more certified specialists.
- On April 28-30, 2 NDOE staffs support Chuuk DOE SPED to facilitate its public hearing and also to provide technical assistance related to early childhood special education and fiscal. In Chuuk, the public hearing was held on the 30th of April with 28 parents and 43 service providers. In addition to the focus areas on ECSE and fiscal, NDOE staffs assisted Chuuk DOE Special Education in data collection and verification. Topic areas covered during the public hearing were allocation of LEA allotments, services in private schools, statewide assessment and accommodations, appropriate and available services to specific disability categories, transportation and related services, lunch services, if allocable, interagency collaboration, medication and coverage, physical therapy, and resource room service.
- On August 5, 2021, outcomes of LEA public hearings and APR/SSIP reports were summarized and presented to FACSSO. The CAP project (Collaboration Across the Pacific), which is an advanced certification academy in the area of severe disability, and autism in particular, was also

presented to FACSSO to get ownership and selection of 2 scholars per state to enroll in this project FSM Special Education is partnering in with University of Hawaii Manoa MCH LEND Program and Center on Disability Studies with San Francisco State University, and the Nika Project.

- On October 18-22, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Chuuk State Special Education program. As usual, the monitoring team met with the Chuuk State Advisory Council (AC) to verify their involvement in planning and executing its advisory role, which include LPP review and development. Also present at the meeting with the Chuuk AC were 3 parents, 6 AC members, and 8 special education staffs. During the monitoring visit, the NDOE team and Chuuk DOE also met with the Chuuk House of Senate Joint Committee of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) and Committee of Judiciary and Governmental Relations (JGR). These meeting opportunities provided insights to NDOE and Chuuk SPED in aligning improvement activities and targets to reflect the concerns and inputs from these stakeholders.
- On October 28, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SSIP meeting with all states and consultants from UOG CEDDERS and Sigma Associates, Inc., to further discuss State Logic Model and the LEA Local Systemic Improvement Plans (LSIP).
- On November 22-26, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Yap State Special Education program. NDOE monitoring team and Yap SPED key staffs met with the Yap Advisory Council and 42 parents and some of the discussion highlights were related to neighboring islands monitoring, the lack of certified or qualified special education teachers and specialists, how the parent survey is administered and access to program information and services. The team also met with the 10th Yap State Legislature to also present special education and related services and answer questions from the legislative members. The outcomes of these meeting also are included in Yap SPED discussions on its LPP/LSIP to ensure that improvement activities and target setting are all based on needs, recommendations, and actual program implementation practices.
- On December 8, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SPP/APR stakeholder meeting with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, and SAI on target setting, data verification, and program implementation practices. The LEA inputs from stakeholders during onsite verification and monitoring visits and public hearings were discussed during this virtual meeting.
- On January 5, 18, and 26, NDOE conducted virtual SPP/APR stakeholders meetings with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, SAI, and NCEO on data verification and target setting for both SEA and LEAs. During these SPP/APR final meetings, Chairmen of AC from some of the states attended and contributed to the discussions on indicator performances and target setting.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

48

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2	4.17%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	10	20.83%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	31	64.58%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	5	10.42%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	41	43	100.00%	80.00%	95.35%	Met target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	36	48	84.85%	65.00%	75.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1	2.08%

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	12	25.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	33	68.75%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2	4.17%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children 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 turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	45	46	98.33%	80.00%	97.83%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	35	48	75.76%	65.00%	72.92%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1	2.08%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	12	25.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	32	66.67%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3	6.25%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children 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 turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	44	45	98.41%	80.00%	97.78%	Met target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	35	48	80.30%	65.00%	72.92%	Met target	No Slippage

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

FSM continues to use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center's Child Outcomes Summary (COS) to report on a child's progress in the three outcome measures. A child who rates 6 or 7 is considered to be developing at age "comparable to age peers." The child's IEP Team, including the parent, Related Service Assistants (RSAs), and teachers, complete the COS. FSM uses multiple sources of information to assist the IEP Team in completing the COS, such as the FSM Inventory of Development (FSM-ID), parent interview, medical reports, evaluation reports, and teacher observations. The Special Education Coordinator from each FSM State/LEA, with assistance of the FSM NDOE Division of Special Services monitors the implementation of the Early Childhood Outcome Measurement System guidelines to ensure the process for gathering the data are accurate, includes all children who meet the criteria for the measurements, and conducted within the specified timelines.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

The FSM provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates stakeholder involvement for soliciting broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. Given FSM's administrative structure, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team, comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs and LEA general education administrators, serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development, which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. The FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project LIFT includes other key stakeholders, including Department specialists, schools administrators, teachers, and parents for the development and implementation of Indicator 17: FSM's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

For the development of FSM's FFY 2020 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 6 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On April 12-16, 2021, 2 FSM NDOE Division of Special Services staffs provided onsite technical assistance to Yap State and also conducted a public hearing on April 13, 2021 on the FFY 2021 OSEP Part B grant application and other program requirements, services, and initiatives. Specific discussion topics and questions from parent and community members during the public hearing include statewide assessment and progress monitoring, IEP and special education services, home services, building and instruction accessibility, teacher certification and quality, certified specialist and off-island referral for diagnosis. The one concern shared by the attendants also is the question of FSM's continued eligibility for IDEA funding beyond 2023, with regards to the US-FSM compact agreement. In attendance were 53 people, which included 42 parents and 11 special education and general education administrators and teachers.
- On April 19-23, 2021, 1 NDOE staff and 2 Pohnpei Special Education administrators conducted a similar technical assistance and public hearing in Kosrae State. The meeting in Kosrae included discussions on the FFY 2021 grant application, and other interest areas such as parent rights, certified specialist in autism and other low-incidence conditions, types of disabilities and what parents should know about them, and IEP and what types of assistive devices can be provided to a child. The meeting in Kosrae consisted of 91 total attendants, of which 34 were parents, 1 state legislator, 3 were

IEP students, and 53 service providers (including special education staffs and school principals and administrators). All the parent participants represented all the four main municipalities of Kosrae and the officers of the Kosrae Advisory Council/Interagency Council were also represented at the meeting.

- On April 27-30, 2021, Pohnpei DOE conducted its public hearing and community outreach with assistance of 4 NDOE Special Education staffs. 4 community public outreach meetings were held with a total of 280 participants. On the 27th, Nett and U community meeting was held with 51 parents and 9 service providers. On the 28th, the meeting was held in Madolenihmw municipality with 103 parents and 17 service providers. On the 29th, the meeting was held in Kitti municipality with 46 parents and 11 service providers. On the 30th, the community public hearing was held in Kolonia for Kolonia and Sokehs communities with 38 parents and 5 service providers. Some of the discussion highlights include local laws for children with disabilities, appropriate special education services based on appropriate assessment, complaint and due process, related services, funding of services, and the need for more certified specialists.
- On April 28-30, 2 NDOE staffs support Chuuk DOE SPED to facilitate its public hearing and also to provide technical assistance related to early childhood special education and fiscal. In Chuuk, the public hearing was held on the 30th of April with 28 parents and 43 service providers. In addition to the focus areas on ECSE and fiscal, NDOE staffs assisted Chuuk DOE Special Education in data collection and verification. Topic areas covered during the public hearing were allocation of LEA allotments, services in private schools, statewide assessment and accommodations, appropriate and available services to specific disability categories, transportation and related services, lunch services, if allocable, interagency collaboration, medication and coverage, physical therapy, and resource room service.
- On August 5, 2021, outcomes of LEA public hearings and APR/SSIP reports were summarized and presented to FACSSO. The CAP project (Collaboration Across the Pacific), which is an advanced certification academy in the area of severe disability, and autism in particular, was also presented to FACSSO to get ownership and selection of 2 scholars per state to enroll in this project FSM Special Education is partnering in with University of Hawaii Manoa MCH LEND Program and Center on Disability Studies with San Francisco State University, and the Nika Project.
- On October 18-22, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Chuuk State Special Education program. As usual, the monitoring team met with the Chuuk State Advisory Council (AC) to verify their involvement in planning and executing its advisory role, which include LPP review and development. Also present at the meeting with the Chuuk AC were 3 parents, 6 AC members, and 8 special education staffs. During the monitoring visit, the NDOE team and Chuuk DOE also met with the Chuuk House of Senate Joint Committee of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) and Committee of Judiciary and Governmental Relations (JGR). These meeting opportunities provided insights to NDOE and Chuuk SPED in aligning improvement activities and targets to reflect the concerns and inputs from these stakeholders.
- On October 28, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SSIP meeting with all states and consultants from UOG CEDDERS and Sigma Associates, Inc., to further discuss State Logic Model and the LEA Local Systemic Improvement Plans (LSIP).
- On November 22-26, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Yap State Special Education program. NDOE monitoring team and Yap SPED key staffs met with the Yap Advisory Council and 42 parents and some of the discussion highlights were related to neighboring islands monitoring, the lack of certified or qualified special education teachers and specialists, how the parent survey is administered and access to program information and services. The team also met with the 10th Yap State Legislature to also present special education and related services and answer questions from the legislative members. The outcomes of these meeting also are included in Yap SPED discussions on its LPP/LSIP to ensure that improvement activities and target setting are all based on needs, recommendations, and actual program implementation practices.
- On December 8, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SPP/APR stakeholder meeting with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, and SAI on target setting, data verification, and program implementation practices. The LEA inputs from stakeholders during onsite verification and monitoring visits and public hearings were discussed during this virtual meeting.
- On January 5, 18, and 26, NDOE conducted virtual SPP/APR stakeholders meetings with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, SAI, and NCEO on data verification and target setting for both SEA and LEAs. During these SPP/APR final meetings, Chairmen of AC from some of the states attended and contributed to the discussions on indicator performances and target setting.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	39.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	61.00%	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%	64.00%
Data	59.23%	67.49%	61.00%	55.20%	55.85%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	49.00%	50.00%	55.00%	60.00%	65.00%	67.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
841	1,705	55.85%	49.00%	49.33%	Met target	No Slippage

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

The FSM parent survey used in FFY 2020 was the same as in previous years. The survey was an adapted version of the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) parent survey. The same process for dissemination and collection was conducted for parents of preschool-aged children with IEPs as with the school-age group.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

1,724

Percentage of respondent parents

98.90%

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	98.01%	98.90%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The FFY 2020 return rate of 98.90% (1705/1724) represents a 0.89% increase in response rate from previous year's 98.01% (1726/1761) response rate in FFY 2019.

Survey dissemination efforts in the four FSM states continued to include paper copies and in-person interviews and translated versions of the survey. Specifically, Yap State utilized their Interagency Advisory Council and parent members to conduct the surveys via interviews. In Pohnpei State, case managers and consulting resource teachers conducted the surveys via interviews or collected the surveys from schools, including the outer islands. In Kosrae State, the Interagency Advisory Council chairperson and one parent member from each municipality conducted the survey via interviews. Special education staff supported the interviews that were not in their assigned schools/municipalities. In Chuuk State, office staff went on the ship to conduct the surveys in the outer islands. In the lagoon islands, the case managers and the special education teachers distributed and collected the surveys from schools and homes.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

The FFY 2020 return rate of 98.90% (1705/1724) is representative of the demographics of the children receiving special education services. Nineteen (19) surveys, representing 1.10%, that were not returned were from three of the four FSM states. An analysis of the demographics of the unreturned surveys did not show any significant difference with the returned surveys, such as the location of the families included families from the main island or municipality and outer or neighboring islands in the three FSM states.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

The FFY 2020 return rate of 98.90% (1705/1724) is representative of the demographics of the children receiving special education services. Nineteen (19) surveys, representing 1.10%, that were not returned were from three of the four FSM states. An analysis of the demographics of the unreturned surveys did not show any significant difference with the returned surveys, such as the location of the families included families from the main island or municipality and outer or neighboring islands in the three FSM states.

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

FSM's FFY 2020 return rate of 98.90% (1705/1724) is representative of the demographics of FSM's children receiving special education services, including ethnicity and geographic. FSM's child count reported ethnicity is 100% Pacific islanders based on OSEP's ethnicity categories. For geographic representation, nineteen (19) surveys, representing 1.10%, were not returned from three of the four FSM states. The percentage from each of the three FSM states was less than a 3% difference: 99.30% (142/143), 97.55% (636/652), and 98.46% (128/130).

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

The FSM provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Per OSEP's instructions, Indicator 9 does not apply to FSM.

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

Per OSEP's instructions, Indicator 10 does not apply to FSM.

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
 - b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
- Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	95.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.07%	100.00%	100.00%	97.59%	97.93%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
179	179	97.93%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

0

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data Source: The evaluation data were taken from the FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS) database system of all children for whom a parental consent to evaluate was received for the report year July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021. The evaluation data are collected through each FSM State/LEA inputting the completion dates into the web-based FSM SITS, based on the completed FSM IDEA procedural forms.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	0	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

In FFY 2019, FSM reported 97.93% (284/290) substantial compliance for Indicator 11, which included six initial evaluations over timeline. As reported in FSM's FFY 2019 APR Indicator 11, all six initial evaluations over timeline were completed between 1 day to 28 days over the 60-day timeline requirement. These six individual noncompliance cases were from one FSM State/LEA, which resulted in FSM NDOE, the SEA, issuing a written notice of findings of noncompliance to the one LEA. Verification of correction to ensure that the LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements was done through a review of the IEP documents and through the quarterly review of the Indicator 11 data in the FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS). Throughout the FFY 2020 reporting year, the quarterly reviews of subsequent or additional Indicator 11 data were monitored to ensure that the LEA was implementing the Indicator 11 regulatory 60-day timeline requirement. The LEA was able to demonstrate 100% compliance with Indicator 11 60-day timeline requirement, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In fact, FSM's FFY 2020 APR Indicator 11 data reported 100% compliance for the reporting period.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case of noncompliance* was corrected

In FFY 2019, FSM reported 97.93% (284/290) significant compliance for Indicator 11, which represented six initial evaluations over timeline. The number of days beyond the timeline for all six initial evaluations was 1- 28 days over the 60-day timeline requirement. It should be noted that although late, all six initial evaluations were completed over timeline, as indicated in FFY 2019. These six individual noncompliance cases were from one FSM State/LEA. FSM NDOE verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected through a review of the actual IEP documents sent to the FSM NDOE as a result of the findings of noncompliance issued to the LEA, and as reflected in the FSM SITS.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because FSM reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the FSM must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, FSM must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, FSM must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the FSM did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why FSM did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

In FFY 2019, FSM reported 97.93% (284/290) substantial compliance for Indicator 11, which included six initial evaluations over timeline. As reported in FSM's FFY 2019 APR Indicator 11, all six initial evaluations over timeline were completed between 1 day to 28 days over the 60-day timeline requirement. These six individual noncompliance cases were from one FSM State/LEA, which resulted in FSM NDOE, the SEA, issuing a written notice of findings of noncompliance to the one LEA. Verification of correction to ensure that the LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements was done through a review of the IEP documents and through the quarterly review of the Indicator 11 data in the FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS). Throughout the FFY 2020 reporting year, the quarterly reviews of subsequent or additional Indicator 11 data were monitored to ensure that the LEA was implementing the Indicator 11 regulatory 60-day timeline requirement. The LEA was able to demonstrate 100% compliance with Indicator 11 60-day timeline requirement, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In fact, FSM's FFY 2020 APR Indicator 11 data reported 100% compliance for the reporting period.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Per OSEP's instructions, Indicator 12 does not apply to FSM. FSM does not receive IDEA Part C funding.

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	88.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
295	295	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data Source: The secondary transition data were taken from the completed Transition Services Record Review Summary forms of all youth with IEPs aged 16 and above for the report year July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021. These completed forms were submitted to FSM-National Department of Education (NDOE). FSM-NDOE verified the submitted data with the youth with IEPs aged 16 and above in the FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS) for the reporting year

Question	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	NO

If no, please explain

FSM chooses to continue reporting Indicator 13 data for youth aged 16 and above with IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, "leavers" who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2009	Target ≥	11.00%	13.00%	14.00%	14.00%	15.00%
A	13.00%	Data	10.38%	22.22%	23.19%	20.91%	10.78%
B	2009	Target ≥	45.00%	50.00%	55.00%	60.00%	50.00%
B	26.00%	Data	40.57%	40.28%	46.38%	38.18%	28.43%
C	2009	Target ≥	62.00%	64.00%	68.00%	70.00%	80.00%
C	34.00%	Data	90.57%	83.33%	100.00%	97.27%	100.00%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A ≥	26.00%	26.00%	27.00%	27.00%	28.00%	29.00%
Target B ≥	40.00%	40.00%	41.00%	41.00%	42.00%	43.00%
Target C ≥	80.00%	80.00%	90.00%	90.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates stakeholder involvement for soliciting broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. Given FSM's administrative structure, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team, comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs and LEA general education administrators, serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development, which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. The FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project LIFT includes other key stakeholders, including Department specialists, schools administrators, teachers, and parents for the development and implementation of Indicator 17: FSM's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

For the development of FSM's FFY 2020 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 6 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On April 12-16, 2021, 2 FSM NDOE Division of Special Services staffs provided onsite technical assistance to Yap State and also conducted a public hearing on April 13, 2021 on the FFY 2021 OSEP Part B grant application and other program requirements, services, and initiatives. Specific discussion topics and questions from parent and community members during the public hearing include statewide assessment and progress monitoring, IEP and special education services, home services, building and instruction accessibility, teacher certification and quality, certified specialist and off-island referral for diagnosis. The one concern shared by the attendants also is the question of FSM's continued eligibility for IDEA funding beyond 2023, with regards to the US-FSM compact agreement. In attendance were 53 people, which included 42 parents and 11 special education and general education administrators and teachers.
- On April 19-23, 2021, 1 NDOE staff and 2 Pohnpei Special Education administrators conducted a similar technical assistance and public hearing in Kosrae State. The meeting in Kosrae included discussions on the FFY 2021 grant application, and other interest areas such as parent rights, certified specialist in autism and other low-incidence conditions, types of disabilities and what parents should know about them, and IEP and what types of assistive devices can be provided to a child. The meeting in Kosrae consisted of 91 total attendants, of which 34 were parents, 1 state legislator, 3 were IEP students, and 53 service providers (including special education staffs and school principals and administrators). All the parent participants represented all the four main municipalities of Kosrae and the officers of the Kosrae Advisory Council/Interagency Council were also represented at the meeting.
- On April 27-30, 2021, Pohnpei DOE conducted its public hearing and community outreach with assistance of 4 NDOE Special Education staffs. 4 community public outreach meetings were held with a total of 280 participants. On the 27th, Nett and U community meeting was held with 51 parents and 9 service providers. On the 28th, the meeting was held in Madolenihmw municipality with 103 parents and 17 service providers. On the 29th, the meeting was held in Kitti municipality with 46 parents and 11 service providers. On the 30th, it the community public hearing was held in Kolonia for Kolonia and Sokehs communities with 38 parents and 5 service providers. Some of the discussion highlights include local laws for children with disabilities, appropriate special education services based on appropriate assessment, complaint and due process, related services, funding of services, and the need for more certified specialists.
- On April 28-30, 2 NDOE staffs support Chuuk DOE SPED to facilitate its public hearing and also to provide technical assistance related to early childhood special education and fiscal. In Chuuk, the public hearing was held on the 30th of April with 28 parents and 43 service providers. In addition to the focus areas on ECSE and fiscal, NDOE staffs assisted Chuuk DOE Special Education in data collection and verification. Topic areas covered during the public hearing were allocation of LEA allotments, services in private schools, statewide assessment and accommodations, appropriate and available services to specific disability categories, transportation and related services, lunch services, if allocable, interagency collaboration, medication and coverage, physical therapy, and resource room service.
- On August 5, 2021, outcomes of LEA public hearings and APR/SSIP reports were summarized and presented to FACSSO. The CAP project (Collaboration Across the Pacific), which is an advanced certification academy in the area of severe disability, and autism in particular, was also presented to FACSSO to get ownership and selection of 2 scholars per state to enroll in this project FSM Special Education is partnering in with University of Hawaii Manoa MCH LEND Program and Center on Disability Studies with San Francisco State University, and the Nika Project.
- On October 18-22, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Chuuk State Special Education program. As usual, the monitoring team met with the Chuuk State Advisory Council (AC) to verify their involvement in planning and executing its advisory role, which include LPP review and development. Also present at the meeting with the Chuuk AC were 3 parents, 6 AC members, and 8 special education staffs. During the monitoring visit, the NDOE team and Chuuk DOE also met with the Chuuk House of Senate Joint Committee of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) and Committee of Judiciary and Governmental Relations (JGR). These meeting opportunities provided insights to NDOE and Chuuk SPED in aligning improvement activities and targets to reflect the concerns and inputs from these stakeholders.
- On October 28, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SSIP meeting with all states and consultants from UOG CEDDERS and Sigma Associates, Inc., to further discuss State Logic Model and the LEA Local Systemic Improvement Plans (LSIP).
- On November 22-26, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Yap State Special Education program. NDOE monitoring team and Yap SPED key staffs met with the Yap Advisory Council and 42 parents and some of the discussion highlights were related to neighboring islands monitoring, the lack of certified or qualified special education teachers and specialists, how the parent survey is administered and access to program information and services. The team also met with the 10th Yap State Legislature to also present special education and related services and answer questions from the legislative members. The outcomes of these meeting also are included in Yap SPED discussions on its LPP/LSIP to ensure that improvement activities and target setting are all based on needs, recommendations, and actual program implementation practices.
- On December 8, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SPP/APR stakeholder meeting with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, and SAI on target setting, data verification, and program implementation practices. The LEA inputs from stakeholders during onsite verification and monitoring visits and public hearings were discussed during this virtual meeting.
- On January 5, 18, and 26, NDOE conducted virtual SPP/APR stakeholders meetings with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, SAI, and NCEO on data verification and target setting for both SEA and LEAs. During these SPP/APR final meetings, Chairmen of AC from some of the states attended and contributed to the discussions on indicator performances and target setting.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	61
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	61
Response Rate	100.00%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	16
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	9
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	1
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	35

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	16	61	10.78%	26.00%	26.23%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	25	61	28.43%	40.00%	40.98%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	61	61	100.00%	80.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	100.00%	100.00%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

In FFY 2020, FSM reported 100% (61/61) return rate, which represented the same percentage as in previous year's return rate of 100% (102/102) for FFY 2019. Following the PSO survey guidance for collecting data, FSM continues to be successful in contacting its leavers and/or their family members to gather required information.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

In FFY 2020, FSM reported 100% (61/61) return rate. Following the PSO survey guidance for collecting data, FSM continues to be successful in contacting its leavers and/or their family members to gather required information.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

In FFY 2020, FSM reported 100% (61/61) return rate, which represents the demographics of the youth who no longer were in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school for the reporting period. For FFY 2020, the leavers were the exiters reported in the IDEA 618 exit data for 2019-2020.

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Not applicable. In FFY 2020, FSM reported 100% (61/61) return rate.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

The FSM provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates stakeholder involvement for soliciting broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. Given FSM's administrative structure, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team, comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs and LEA general education administrators, serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development, which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. The FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project LIFT includes other key stakeholders, including Department specialists, schools administrators, teachers, and parents for the development and implementation of Indicator 17: FSM's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

For the development of FSM's FFY 2020 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 6 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On April 12-16, 2021, 2 FSM NDOE Division of Special Services staffs provided onsite technical assistance to Yap State and also conducted a public hearing on April 13, 2021 on the FFY 2021 OSEP Part B grant application and other program requirements, services, and initiatives. Specific discussion topics and questions from parent and community members during the public hearing include statewide assessment and progress monitoring, IEP and special education services, home services, building and instruction accessibility, teacher certification and quality, certified specialist and off-island referral for diagnosis. The one concern shared by the attendants also is the question of FSM's continued eligibility for IDEA funding beyond 2023, with regards to the US-FSM compact agreement. In attendance were 53 people, which included 42 parents and 11 special education and general education administrators and teachers.
- On April 19-23, 2021, 1 NDOE staff and 2 Pohnpei Special Education administrators conducted a similar technical assistance and public hearing in Kosrae State. The meeting in Kosrae included discussions on the FFY 2021 grant application, and other interest areas such as parent rights, certified specialist in autism and other low-incidence conditions, types of disabilities and what parents should know about them, and IEP and what types of assistive devices can be provided to a child. The meeting in Kosrae consisted of 91 total attendants, of which 34 were parents, 1 state legislator, 3 were IEP students, and 53 service providers (including special education staffs and school principals and administrators). All the parent participants represented all the four main municipalities of Kosrae and the officers of the Kosrae Advisory Council/Interagency Council were also represented at the meeting.
- On April 27-30, 2021, Pohnpei DOE conducted its public hearing and community outreach with assistance of 4 NDOE Special Education staffs. 4 community public outreach meetings were held with a total of 280 participants. On the 27th, Nett and U community meeting was held with 51 parents and 9 service providers. On the 28th, the meeting was held in Madolenihmw municipality with 103 parents and 17 service providers. On the 29th, the meeting was held in Kitti municipality with 46 parents and 11 service providers. On the 30th, the community public hearing was held in Kolonia for Kolonia and Sokehs communities with 38 parents and 5 service providers. Some of the discussion highlights include local laws for children with disabilities, appropriate special education services based on appropriate assessment, complaint and due process, related services, funding of services,

and the need for more certified specialists.

- On April 28-30, 2 NDOE staffs support Chuuk DOE SPED to facilitate its public hearing and also to provide technical assistance related to early childhood special education and fiscal. In Chuuk, the public hearing was held on the 30th of April with 28 parents and 43 service providers. In addition to the focus areas on ECSE and fiscal, NDOE staffs assisted Chuuk DOE Special Education in data collection and verification. Topic areas covered during the public hearing were allocation of LEA allotments, services in private schools, statewide assessment and accommodations, appropriate and available services to specific disability categories, transportation and related services, lunch services, if allocable, interagency collaboration, medication and coverage, physical therapy, and resource room service.
- On August 5, 2021, outcomes of LEA public hearings and APR/SSIP reports were summarized and presented to FACSSO. The CAP project (Collaboration Across the Pacific), which is an advanced certification academy in the area of severe disability, and autism in particular, was also presented to FACSSO to get ownership and selection of 2 scholars per state to enroll in this project FSM Special Education is partnering in with University of Hawaii Manoa MCH LEND Program and Center on Disability Studies with San Francisco State University, and the Nika Project.
- On October 18-22, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Chuuk State Special Education program. As usual, the monitoring team met with the Chuuk State Advisory Council (AC) to verify their involvement in planning and executing its advisory role, which include LPP review and development. Also present at the meeting with the Chuuk AC were 3 parents, 6 AC members, and 8 special education staffs. During the monitoring visit, the NDOE team and Chuuk DOE also met with the Chuuk House of Senate Joint Committee of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) and Committee of Judiciary and Governmental Relations (JGR). These meeting opportunities provided insights to NDOE and Chuuk SPED in aligning improvement activities and targets to reflect the concerns and inputs from these stakeholders.
- On October 28, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SSIP meeting with all states and consultants from UOG CEDDERS and Sigma Associates, Inc., to further discuss State Logic Model and the LEA Local Systemic Improvement Plans (LSIP).
- On November 22-26, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Yap State Special Education program. NDOE monitoring team and Yap SPED key staffs met with the Yap Advisory Council and 42 parents and some of the discussion highlights were related to neighboring islands monitoring, the lack of certified or qualified special education teachers and specialists, how the parent survey is administered and access to program information and services. The team also met with the 10th Yap State Legislature to also present special education and related services and answer questions from the legislative members. The outcomes of these meeting also are included in Yap SPED discussions on its LPP/LSIP to ensure that improvement activities and target setting are all based on needs, recommendations, and actual program implementation practices.
- On December 8, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SPP/APR stakeholder meeting with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, and SAI on target setting, data verification, and program implementation practices. The LEA inputs from stakeholders during onsite verification and monitoring visits and public hearings were discussed during this virtual meeting.
- On January 5, 18, and 26, NDOE conducted virtual SPP/APR stakeholders meetings with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, SAI, and NCEO on data verification and target setting for both SEA and LEAs. During these SPP/APR final meetings, Chairmen of AC from some of the states attended and contributed to the discussions on indicator performances and target setting.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0		0.00%		N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The FSM reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2020. The FSM is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i))$ divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates stakeholder involvement for soliciting broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. Given FSM's administrative structure, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team, comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs and LEA general education administrators, serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development, which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. The FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project LIFT includes other key stakeholders, including Department specialists, schools administrators, teachers, and parents for the development and implementation of Indicator 17: FSM's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

For the development of FSM's FFY 2020 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 6 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On April 12-16, 2021, 2 FSM NDOE Division of Special Services staffs provided onsite technical assistance to Yap State and also conducted a public hearing on April 13, 2021 on the FFY 2021 OSEP Part B grant application and other program requirements, services, and initiatives. Specific discussion topics and questions from parent and community members during the public hearing include statewide assessment and progress monitoring, IEP and special education services, home services, building and instruction accessibility, teacher certification and quality, certified specialist and off-island referral for diagnosis. The one concern shared by the attendants also is the question of FSM's continued eligibility for IDEA funding beyond 2023, with regards to the US-FSM compact agreement. In attendance were 53 people, which included 42 parents and 11 special education and general education administrators and teachers.
- On April 19-23, 2021, 1 NDOE staff and 2 Pohnpei Special Education administrators conducted a similar technical assistance and public hearing in Kosrae State. The meeting in Kosrae included discussions on the FFY 2021 grant application, and other interest areas such as parent rights, certified specialist in autism and other low-incidence conditions, types of disabilities and what parents should know about them, and IEP and what types of assistive devices can be provided to a child. The meeting in Kosrae consisted of 91 total attendants, of which 34 were parents, 1 state legislator, 3 were IEP students, and 53 service providers (including special education staffs and school principals and administrators). All the parent participants represented all the four main municipalities of Kosrae and the officers of the Kosrae Advisory Council/Interagency Council were also represented at the meeting.
- On April 27-30, 2021, Pohnpei DOE conducted its public hearing and community outreach with assistance of 4 NDOE Special Education staffs. 4 community public outreach meetings were held with a total of 280 participants. On the 27th, Nett and U community meeting was held with 51 parents and 9 service providers. On the 28th, the meeting was held in Madolenihmw municipality with 103 parents and 17 service providers. On the 29th, the meeting was held in Kitti municipality with 46 parents and 11 service providers. On the 30th, the community public hearing was held in Kolonia for

Kolonia and Sokehs communities with 38 parents and 5 service providers. Some of the discussion highlights include local laws for children with disabilities, appropriate special education services based on appropriate assessment, complaint and due process, related services, funding of services, and the need for more certified specialists.

- On April 28-30, 2 NDOE staffs support Chuuk DOE SPED to facilitate its public hearing and also to provide technical assistance related to early childhood special education and fiscal. In Chuuk, the public hearing was held on the 30th of April with 28 parents and 43 service providers. In addition to the focus areas on ECSE and fiscal, NDOE staffs assisted Chuuk DOE Special Education in data collection and verification. Topic areas covered during the public hearing were allocation of LEA allotments, services in private schools, statewide assessment and accommodations, appropriate and available services to specific disability categories, transportation and related services, lunch services, if allocable, interagency collaboration, medication and coverage, physical therapy, and resource room service.
- On August 5, 2021, outcomes of LEA public hearings and APR/SSIP reports were summarized and presented to FACSSO. The CAP project (Collaboration Across the Pacific), which is an advanced certification academy in the area of severe disability, and autism in particular, was also presented to FACSSO to get ownership and selection of 2 scholars per state to enroll in this project FSM Special Education is partnering in with University of Hawaii Manoa MCH LEND Program and Center on Disability Studies with San Francisco State University, and the Nika Project.
- On October 18-22, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Chuuk State Special Education program. As usual, the monitoring team met with the Chuuk State Advisory Council (AC) to verify their involvement in planning and executing its advisory role, which include LPP review and development. Also present at the meeting with the Chuuk AC were 3 parents, 6 AC members, and 8 special education staffs. During the monitoring visit, the NDOE team and Chuuk DOE also met with the Chuuk House of Senate Joint Committee of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) and Committee of Judiciary and Governmental Relations (JGR). These meeting opportunities provided insights to NDOE and Chuuk SPED in aligning improvement activities and targets to reflect the concerns and inputs from these stakeholders.
- On October 28, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SSIP meeting with all states and consultants from UOG CEDDERS and Sigma Associates, Inc., to further discuss State Logic Model and the LEA Local Systemic Improvement Plans (LSIP).
- On November 22-26, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Yap State Special Education program. NDOE monitoring team and Yap SPED key staffs met with the Yap Advisory Council and 42 parents and some of the discussion highlights were related to neighboring islands monitoring, the lack of certified or qualified special education teachers and specialists, how the parent survey is administered and access to program information and services. The team also met with the 10th Yap State Legislature to also present special education and related services and answer questions from the legislative members. The outcomes of these meeting also are included in Yap SPED discussions on its LPP/LSIP to ensure that improvement activities and target setting are all based on needs, recommendations, and actual program implementation practices.
- On December 8, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SPP/APR stakeholder meeting with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, and SAI on target setting, data verification, and program implementation practices. The LEA inputs from stakeholders during onsite verification and monitoring visits and public hearings were discussed during this virtual meeting.
- On January 5, 18, and 26, NDOE conducted virtual SPP/APR stakeholders meetings with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, SAI, and NCEO on data verification and target setting for both SEA and LEAs. During these SPP/APR final meetings, Chairmen of AC from some of the states attended and contributed to the discussions on indicator performances and target setting.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0		0.00%		N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The FSM reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2020. The FSM is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

Increase English literacy skills of all students in ECE through Grade 5 in the FSM, with a particular focus on students identified as having a disability.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

FSM utilizes the revised logic model as its theory of action (if, then). Refer to Section B for an explanation of its revisions and use.

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

<https://www.fsmsped.org/resources/1/9>

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

Refer to Sections B and C for explanation of changes.

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

YES

Historical Data

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2018	27.00%
B	2018	2.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	28.00%	29.00%	30.00%	31.00%	32.00%	33.00%
Target B >=	7.00%	9.00%	11.00%	13.00%	15.00%	17.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Part	Students at the model schools who scored at Benchmark	Students who were tested and received a valid score at the model schools	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	112	486		28.00%	23.05%	Did not meet target	N/A

B	1	33		7.00%	3.03%	Did not meet target	N/A
---	---	----	--	-------	-------	---------------------	-----

Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

As described in FSM's SSIP Phase I, the selection of FSM's SiMR was determined through the review of baseline data collected from all grade levels at the four original pilot elementary schools within Project LIFT (Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow). The Project LIFT Assessment System includes various curriculum-based measures at each grade level, ECE through Grade 5. Many, although not all, of these assessments include measures from the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) a series of procedures and measures for assessment of the acquisition of a set of K-8 literacy skills developed and researched at the University of Oregon.

The FFY 2020 data, as in previous year's submission, are retrieved from the FSM Early Literacy Monitoring (ELMo) web-based student data system.

The baseline, FFY 2020 data, and targets displayed as A and B are:

A = All students at the model schools = 23.05% (112/486) representing 112 students scoring at benchmark (numerator) out of 486 students who took the test and received a valid score (denominator).

B = Students with IEPs at the model schools = 3.03% (1/33) representing 1 student with an IEP scoring at benchmark (numerator) out of 33 students with an IEP who took the test and received a valid score (denominator).

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

Student performance data are retrieved from FSM's Early Literacy Monitoring (ELMo) web-based student data system. Each model/scale-up school is able to input each assessment result directly into the system and view student performance data instantly at the individual, classroom, and state levels. ELMo requires access permissions for ensuring confidentiality. NDOE is responsible for providing each State-Level/LEA Project LIFT Team member with their level of access, depending upon their role for inputting and/or viewing student data. At the National or SEA level, NDOE is able to view all student data to monitor assessment participation and performance data.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

<https://www.fsmsped.org/resources/1/9>

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.

FSM revised its SSIP evaluation plan based on revisions to the SSIP logic model to reflect current implementation in each state as well as national implementation of SSIP strategies and activities. The first strategy articulated in the logic model focuses on the implementation of the RTI model, with particular emphasis placed on building teacher capacity, engaging in ongoing and frequent assessment of performance, enhancing student learning, and continuing to build capacity at each state level for implementing a comprehensive RTI program. Infrastructure improvement activities conducted under Strategy 1 of the logic model include model and scale up school teacher training, ongoing coaching supports, implementation of fall, winter and spring screening and ongoing progress monitoring of student learning, and training and technical assistance to state level RTI teams.

Strategy 2 of FSM's revised logic model addresses the importance of enhancing family partnerships to support improved early literacy outcomes for students in FSM. FSM NDOE and its State Departments of Education (SDOE's) will leverage the work happening in its newly awarded OSEP personnel preparation and leadership grants, focusing on implementing new activities designed to improve family engagement in model and scale up schools. School and State personnel will have access to parent friendly materials, designs for school level family engagement activities, and other resources created by scholars in these two FSM grant programs. In addition, model and scale up schools will continue to build upon the family engagement strategies implemented during the first cycle of the SSIP. Infrastructure improvement activities that are aligned with this strategy will commence in Year 2 of this SSIP cycle.

Strategy 3 focuses on the continued work of enhancing community collaboration to support improved early literacy outcomes in FSM. In particular, NDOE will encourage State RTI teams to provide regular updates on progress to stakeholders and other education agency staff. Through regular quarterly evaluation meetings with each State team and NDOE liaison, opportunities for connections to other educational initiatives will be explored to leverage efforts within States and across FSM.

If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.

FSM revised its SSIP evaluation plan based on revisions to the SSIP logic model to reflect current implementation in each state as well as national implementation of SSIP strategies and activities.

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

Professional Development (PD) and Technical Assistance (TA)

Training for model and scale up schools continues to be a priority for National and State RTI teams. During this reporting period, trainings for all coaches, teachers, and other support personnel in all project schools, including scale up schools, were conducted. FSM NDOE also engaged in webinars provided by OSEP TA centers.

As part of its intensive TA support to FSM, NCEO provided a series of assessment trainings for State RTI teams and teachers. This work began with "Assessment 101" trainings that discussed the purposes of assessment, types of assessment, how to use data to measure progress and achievement, formative assessment for instructional planning, and a review of RTI.

The second series of sessions focused on increasing the skills of special education coordinators to use interim and other assessment data to inform RTI intervention support for students. These sessions included application activities on aligning assessments to standards, using learning progressions to set intervention goals, and planning for training of teachers locally.

The last set of sessions focused on monitoring student progress toward intervention goals. This included a review of RTI, the use of assessments to track student progress, and inform IEP goals. Sample student data was used to engage participants in making instructional decisions based on student needs.

Guam CEDDERS continues to support NDOE in its efforts to improve educational results for students with disabilities. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic impacting travel to the FSM, Guam CEDDERS continued to provide virtual technical assistance and training through Zoom video conferencing during this reporting period. Content-specific activities addressing the SSIP/SiMR included the following: administering appropriate assessments for determining student eligibility; improving supports for children with autism spectrum disorder (ASD); improving data collection and reporting processes at the State-level; and facilitating stakeholder engagement in the development of FSM's FFY 2020-FFY 2025 State Performance Plan, inclusive of the SSIP.

Sigma Associates Incorporated, external evaluators for FSM's SSIP and developers of FSM's ELMo system, provided several TA activities to SDOEs. Sigma conducted a series of virtual TA activities designed to continue to build capacity for each RTI team to conduct internal evaluation of their system and initiatives in order to address continuous improvement efforts. Sigma's work focused on supporting each state to develop a logic model that is reflective of their implementation level and context. In addition to its evaluation technical assistance and capacity building to states, Sigma provided on-going TA and support to state RTI teams as they utilized the features of ELMo to collect and analyze student level early literacy data.

In addition to the PD and TA described above, FSM NDOE has been awarded two OSEP funded grants: one focused on building special education leadership, and the other focused on teacher retention. The awards of these two grants have provided FSM with a unique opportunity to develop a comprehensive PD and training system that will serve as the catalyst for providing ongoing support to all schools and states across FSM. Specific components of the grants will be leveraged to support SSIP schools. In particular, PD modules will be developed from both grants on topics including understanding of the core components of effective family engagement, selection and implementation of EBPs, using implementation science to guide systems change, assessing students with disabilities, and reflective leadership practices.

Data Systems

FSM staff and stakeholders utilize the FSM NDOE Early Literacy Monitoring (ELMo) data system to capture and analyze data related to the SiMR. As part of the data sharing agreement, FSM NDOE provide these data for model schools to the external evaluators. ELMo provides "real-time" child-level data, which is analyzed at the child, school, and state level. NDOE staff, state RTI teams and coaches all receive training and technical support on ELMo's content and use. The FSM ELMo system continued to be upgraded throughout this reporting period.

Sigma finalized the progress monitoring data collection and dashboard component of the data system. This includes visualization of on-track measures, data filters, and student and school level summary data. Other components currently under development include the component to capture coaching related activities (e.g., logs of onsite visits, classroom observation data).

Accountability and Monitoring

As part of its efforts to reflect the current scope of FSM SSIP implementation, NDOE and its SDOEs worked with the external evaluators to create an LSIP template that is aligned with the new logic model and each State's specific logic model, as well as the revised evaluation plan. Specifically, the template allows states to describe actions related to the short or mid-term outcomes they are addressing in each school year, and to provide progress updates each quarter. Quarterly implementation data is provided by the evaluators, as well as other data elements that may inform performance. The alignment of the new LSIP template to the logic model was conducted in order to create a more comprehensive accountability model to assess how each SDOE is carrying out its specific SSIP improvement strategies and to capture data at each state level that will contribute to continuous improvement efforts. Quarterly reviews of the LSIPs are conducted by NDOE, in collaboration with the external evaluator and SDOEs.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

NDOE staff, State RTI team members, external consultants, and various stakeholders partner to carry out the evaluation efforts for FSM's SSIP. The SSIP evaluation plan is designed to assess both the processes and impact of implementing the strategies and activities identified in the Logic Model, leading to the SiMR goal of increasing English literacy skills of all students in ECE through Grade 5, in FSM, with a particular focus on students identified with having a disability. Over the course of the reporting period, NDOE and SDOEs have engaged in several evaluation activities to monitor and measure strategies and outcomes to assess the effectiveness of the SSIP implementation plan.

The evaluation plan utilizes a mixed methods design, using both qualitative and quantitative data and continuous feedback loops to ensure program improvement. By using different sources and methods at various points in the evaluation process, the evaluators can build on the strength of each type of approach used in a mixed method design and simultaneously, minimize inherent weakness in any one method. In addition, using a variety of methods in the evaluation can strengthen the validity of results and findings.

An important aspect of conducting an evaluation in FSM is the consideration of culture and its context within the implementation of the SSIP. Culturally responsive evaluators honor the cultural context in which an evaluation takes place by bringing needed, shared life experience and understandings to the evaluation tasks (Frierson, Hood, Stafford, & Hughes, 2002). Evaluators from Sigma Associates Incorporated (SAI) strive to ensure that cultural considerations are always in the forefront of the development of data collection instruments, analysis procedures, and reporting.

The FSM SSIP evaluation incorporates all of these aspects (partnership, mixed methods, cultural responsiveness) into the logic model and evaluation plan. The following describes progress made toward short- and intermediate outcomes in terms of each strategy, including corresponding infrastructure components and activities.

Implementing RTI Effectively

The majority of the FSM SSIP short- and mid-term outcomes relate to effective implementation of RTI at the model and scale-up schools. The TA, PD, and coaching described above contributed to achieving the following short-term outcomes: (1) teachers' increased knowledge of the core reading program, (2) teachers' increased knowledge in using data for instructional decision making, and (3) coaches effectively supporting the teachers' reading instruction. These activities are critical to building the instructional practices that support improved student reading. Contributing to the mid-term outcome that teachers provide reading instruction with fidelity, coaches conduct regular observations as part of effective RTI implementation.

Using the data systems, literacy coaches and RTI teams address effective implementation defined by the short-term outcome that screening and assessment data is consistently used, and the mid-term outcome that teachers use data to plan instruction and make decisions about students' needs.

As part of the accountability and monitoring, the State RTI teams review results and progress to identify how best to support their schools and students, and NDOE provides feedback and support to these State-level reviews. This ensures the national and state staff and stakeholders are addressing all the short and mid-term outcomes noted above.

Family Partnerships

Activities continue at the school level to address the short-term outcome to increase families' awareness of early literacy efforts. Student results are shared at PTA meetings, and literacy nights have become a part of school level schedules. These efforts will be supported by focused PD from OSEP-funded project Scholars in the coming school year so that school level staff and administrators have knowledge of effective strategies for partnering with families and can develop strategies to address the mid-term outcome that families understand how to support their students reading at home. This coordinated approach will facilitate sustainability by aiding schools in grounding their literacy - and other - efforts in effective family partnerships.

Community Collaboration

As described previously, the governance structure of the State RTI teams facilitates engagement of representatives from parent councils, general education, and other agencies at the state level and guides efforts to improve English reading proficiency. Tracking process outcomes related to RTI team membership, number and focus of the meetings convened, and dissemination of SiMR results, will ensure accountability and address the short-term outcome that stakeholders are aware of the literacy efforts. Through regular reviews of LSIP activities, the teams will assess progress and identify areas where additional and/or different strategies might be needed. This may include making connections with other community agencies or organizations. For example, if PD efforts are stalled due to scheduling conflicts, RTI team members may work with others in the SDOE to plan coordinated PD; raising awareness of SSIP activities and efforts and how these can be coordinated with other initiatives.

The State RTI team structure has potential for sustaining efforts across FSM in that the regular cross-State sharing of information and successes at regular points in time builds a national community focused on the mid-term outcome of collaborating to support early literacy efforts.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

N/A. No new infrastructure improvement strategies.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

Staff and stakeholders at the NDOE, model and scale up schools, and State RTI teams implement four evidence-based practices that contribute to improved early literacy outcomes for children in FSM, including children with disabilities. The evidence-based practices utilized in FSM's SSIP include the following:

- Response to Intervention (RTI)
- Curriculum-Based Measures (DIBELS)
- Early Literacy Reading Programs-Language for Learning and Reading Mastery
- Literacy Coaching

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Response to Intervention

FSM utilizes Response to Intervention (RTI) to provide early, systematic, and appropriate intensive assistance to FSM students, including students with disabilities, who are at risk for or already underperforming, as compared to their peers, in early literacy. As part of its RTI model, FSM employs universal screening, frequent progress monitoring, review of data, and increased intensive research-based literacy instruction for children who continue to have difficulty in early literacy. In addition to the school-based student level support, each State provides leadership and guidance to ensure implementation is effective and that scale up is determined based on review of data and progress. This teaming at the school, State, and National levels is a critical component of the FSM SSIP.

Curriculum-Based Measures-CBMs (DIBELS)

A critical component of RTI is a systematic assessment of student learning. FSM has adapted a set of consistent screening and assessment protocols aligned to the science of reading principles and to grade level development of English language skills. The screening protocols include measures that address specific skills such as oral reading fluency, decoding, and comprehension which are indicators of early reading success. Each of the SSIP schools consistently administer and analyze the data from these protocols to inform instruction and identify supports for those students who continue to struggle.

Early Literacy Reading Programs

FSM is using Reading Mastery and Language for Learning programs which include explicit and systematic teaching of reading knowledge and skills. These programs are grounded in Direct Instruction which addresses systematic and explicit teaching. Teachers are equipped with materials and a specific scope and sequence to guide their reading instruction. These important instructional elements are essential for both English reading development and instruction in the vernacular languages.

Coaching

FSM has a structured instructional coaching system integrated into their early literacy PD/TA. Each State has identified a lead coach who receives ongoing PD to assist them in providing teachers at the schools' support in English language reading instruction. Based on the literature on effective coaching, the coaches provide regular monthly PD to teachers, follow-up coaching, observation and feedback. Some of the coaches are embedded at the SSIP schools, and all work closely with principals to share responsibility for effective implementation of reading instruction.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

The evidence-based practices described above are integrated into activities that provide structured procedures for English language reading instruction. RTI processes ensure leadership and support at the school, State, and National levels. By using common evidence-based reading programs, and measurement PD and coaching to teachers at model and scale up schools across the States is delivered consistently while also incorporating contextual factors. Use of the ELMo data system to collect consistent measures of reading skills allows for coaches to implement common strategies to support school and State RTI teams to interpret results and make decisions regarding instruction and implementation. These common practices facilitate connection and learning for the States as the teams can share successes and barriers and identify effective procedures to support English language reading instruction. The teaming structures at the school and State level also provide a mechanism for NDOE to identify TA and supports they may need to provide, as well as policy and procedure development to sustain efforts to improve students' early literacy skills.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

A key component to addressing fidelity of implementation to the RTI model is addressed in the first strategy of the logic model. This strategy concentrates on the need for continuous support and monitoring of implementation on multiple levels, including at the teacher, coach and student level. Specific activities undertaken during this reporting period include: 1) coaches and RTI team members engaging in observation and walk-throughs designed to assess teacher practice, 2) State RTI teams conducting RTI meetings, and 3) NDOE review of and feedback on State LSIPs.

Teacher Observations: Observation of teacher practice provides a more objective assessment of implementation. Coaches and school administration conduct observations on regular intervals using observation protocols to assess the fidelity of implementation of the core reading programs (Reading Mastery and Language for Learning). Coaches and administrators have been trained on the core components of each observation instrument. RTI coaches conducted observations of model school ECE through Grade 5 classrooms. A total of 20 observations were conducted to assess 29 instructional practices. Results indicate that 69% of those practices were being implemented with fidelity. Many of the 31% of practices not yet at fidelity were related to pacing of lessons and adequate time to complete lessons. Of note, all nine (9) Language for Learning practices were at the fidelity level.

LSIP Reviews: The quarterly review of each State's LSIP facilitates continuous improvement and assists State's in making progress on their activities. As described previously, the LSIPs are aligned to each State's logic model and serve as the implementation plan. To assure progress is made, State staff and stakeholders track progress as well as need for support from NDOE through quarterly reporting. NDOE staff will review the quarterly LSIP reports and provide feedback and support to aid in successful implementation in each State. As part of the SSIP Evaluation, State LSIPs will be reviewed to assess progress, and track adjustments made based on data review at the State level.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

PD and TA Survey Data: As articulated in previous sections of this report, a variety of professional development and technical assistance supports were provided to FSM RTI teams and model and scale up schools. Evaluation data was collected across a sample of PD and TA activities that examined increased knowledge in either instructional practices or data analysis, interpretation and use. Of the PD and TA activities evaluated, 86% of participants reported an increase in knowledge of utilizing various instructional practices to support individual learning. Similarly, 87% of PD and training respondents reported knowledge gain in data analysis, interpretation and use.

In addition to evaluation data collected regarding knowledge gained from a sample of PD and TA opportunities provided to SDOEs and model and scale up schools, each State described their own state level training provided on the reading programs at model schools, and all teachers at scale-up schools. To ensure consistent data collection, external evaluators are working to create a set of common items to be included in the end-of-training evaluations. To date, these trainings have had more informal feedback on satisfaction.

State Self-Reflection: The new cycle of the FSM SSIP has led to the development and use of new evaluation instruments aligned to the revised logic model and evaluation plan. The previous self-assessment has been replaced with the State Self-Reflection of Implementation instrument. This data collection instrument captures state level information regarding effective practices (i.e., core reading program, instructional strategies and effective coaching), effective implementation including ongoing assessment and leadership capacity, and enabling context, including family partnerships and community collaboration, all contributing to improved English literacy skills for students ECE-G5. In coming years, this State RTI team self-reflection will be facilitated at the start of the school year to inform LSIPs development. Key findings from the initial administration of the state self-reflection include:

- States noted that supports for core reading instruction are effective
- Coaching supports are effective as evidenced by the use of ELMo data, observations, progress monitoring activities, and comfort level of teachers
- Data is being used at both the school level, including classroom as well as at the state level, to guide instructional decision making and implementation
- Additional supports are needed to strengthen scale up school capacity to implement RTI and bring on new scale up schools
- Scale up plans are variable across states
- States continue to engage family in literacy initiatives at the school level
- Data on implementation is shared with various stakeholders-at PTA meetings, summer trainings, public meetings, and state level team meetings

Curriculum Based Measures (DIBELS): Data is collected at three points in time during the school year. These data are used to report progress toward the SiMR (see Section A above). Trend data for the aggregate percentage of students reaching proficient over the past three years across the three assessment periods --beginning of the year (BOY), middle of the year (MOY), and end of the year (EOY), indicate an overall improvement. These data include students at the scale up schools for the 2020-2021 SY. BOY proficiency percentages increased from 34% in SY 2018-2019 to 40% in SY 2020-2021. MOY proficiency percentages increased from 31% to 35% in those same school years. EOY data were incomplete due to COVID-19 and lack of data collected in the Spring of 2020.

Coaching Data: All coaches continue to capture their coaching data in a coaching log. This includes date, duration, topic, and next steps for their coaching with individual teachers. In addition, regular PD sessions are provided to teachers at the school level, and these will also be included in the

evaluation data collection. These data will be captured in the ELMo data dashboard, beginning in the next reporting cycle, as this feature in ELMo is finalized.

Scale Up School Principal Interviews: Evaluators interviewed the two scale up school principals, using a protocol of fourteen questions addressing school learning policies and student growth in the school. The questions addressed challenges faced by the school, observations on student learning, the impact of the environment and the role it played in academic success, as well as school policies surrounding measurement of success. These results will be used to frame a contextual “baseline” or starting point for the scale-up schools so that progress and implementation can be tracked in more detail. High level findings from the interviews include:

- Students have on-level assessment results and are able to access reading resources but that the resources themselves are insufficient
- Assessment results are used as a marker for student development and at-risk students have tutorials made accessible to them to aid in learning
- Most students do not speak English at home
- Classroom activities are sometimes peer-to-peer and reading is done in small groups but also individually, giving them a variety of ways to learn.
- Building teams occur at the grade-level-either lower or upper grades- or at a subject level, and collaboration is fostered lesson study, peer coaching, mini workshops
- To track the progress of the students, the school administers a summative and informal assessment, a quarter ending assessment, and other practical strategies to measure effectiveness of the instruction.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

All four evidence-based practices will continue in the coming year of SSIP implementation. All model and scale up schools will continue to utilize an RTI model to provide early, systematic, and appropriate intensive assistance to FSM students. Coaching support will be provided to all schools engaged in SSIP activities. New coaches will receive additional training and professional development to support skill building in coaching strategies. In addition, literacy coaches will work with TA providers to develop a set of resources for use by new coaches as the RTI efforts are scaled up and/or scaled out in each State. All SSIP schools will engage in continued professional development and technical assistance as they implement the components of RTI as well as the evidence-based literacy curriculum and the use of CBMs. NODE and State staff and stakeholders will continue to work on identifying effective practices to support leadership in the areas of family engagement and community collaboration. Evaluators will continue to collect data on the fidelity of implementation of the EBPs and enhancements to both NDOE and SDOEs infrastructure to support SSIP activities.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates stakeholder involvement for soliciting broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. Given FSM's administrative structure, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team, comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs and LEA general education administrators, serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development, which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. The FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project LIFT includes other key stakeholders, including Department specialists, schools administrators, teachers, and parents for the development and implementation of Indicator 17: FSM's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

For the development of FSM's FFY 2020 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 6 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On April 12-16, 2021, 2 FSM NDOE Division of Special Services staffs provided onsite technical assistance to Yap State and also conducted a public hearing on April 13, 2021 on the FFY 2021 OSEP Part B grant application and other program requirements, services, and initiatives. Specific discussion topics and questions from parent and community members during the public hearing include statewide assessment and progress monitoring, IEP and special education services, home services, building and instruction accessibility, teacher certification and quality, certified specialist and off-island referral for diagnosis. The one concern shared by the attendants also is the question of FSM's continued eligibility for IDEA funding beyond 2023, with regards to the US-FSM compact agreement. In attendance were 53 people, which included 42 parents and 11 special education and general education administrators and teachers.
- On April 19-23, 2021, 1 NDOE staff and 2 Pohnpei Special Education administrators conducted a similar technical assistance and public hearing in Kosrae State. The meeting in Kosrae included discussions on the FFY 2021 grant application, and other interest areas such as parent rights, certified specialist in autism and other low-incidence conditions, types of disabilities and what parents should know about them, and IEP and what types of assistive devices can be provided to a child. The meeting in Kosrae consisted of 91 total attendants, of which 34 were parents, 1 state legislator, 3 were IEP students, and 53 service providers (including special education staffs and school principals and administrators). All the parent participants represented all the four main municipalities of Kosrae and the officers of the Kosrae Advisory Council/Interagency Council were also represented at the meeting.
- On April 27-30, 2021, Pohnpei DOE conducted its public hearing and community outreach with assistance of 4 NDOE Special Education staffs. 4 community public outreach meetings were held with a total of 280 participants. On the 27th, Nett and U community meeting was held with 51 parents and 9 service providers. On the 28th, the meeting was held in Madolenihmw municipality with 103 parents and 17 service providers. On the 29th, the meeting was held in Kitti municipality with 46 parents and 11 service providers. On the 30th, it the community public hearing was held in Kolonia for Kolonia and Sokehs communities with 38 parents and 5 service providers. Some of the discussion highlights include local laws for children with disabilities, appropriate special education services based on appropriate assessment, complaint and due process, related services, funding of services, and the need for more certified specialists.
- On April 28-30, 2 NDOE staffs support Chuuk DOE SPED to facilitate its public hearing and also to provide technical assistance related to early childhood special education and fiscal. In Chuuk, the public hearing was held on the 30th of April with 28 parents and 43 service providers. In addition to the focus areas on ECSE and fiscal, NDOE staffs assisted Chuuk DOE Special Education in data collection and verification. Topic areas covered during the public hearing were allocation of LEA allotments, services in private schools, statewide assessment and accommodations, appropriate and available services to specific disability categories, transportation and related services, lunch services, if allocable, interagency collaboration, medication and coverage, physical therapy, and resource room service.
- On August 5, 2021, outcomes of LEA public hearings and APR/SSIP reports were summarized and presented to FACSSO. The CAP project (Collaboration Across the Pacific), which is an advanced certification academy in the area of severe disability, and autism in particular, was also presented to FACSSO to get ownership and selection of 2 scholars per state to enroll in this project FSM Special Education is partnering in with University of Hawaii Manoa MCH LEND Program and Center on Disability Studies with San Francisco State University, and the Nika Project.
- On October 18-22, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Chuuk State Special Education program. As usual, the monitoring team met with the Chuuk State Advisory Council (AC) to verify their involvement in planning and executing its advisory role, which include LPP review and development. Also present at the meeting with the Chuuk AC were 3 parents, 6 AC members, and 8 special education staffs. During the

monitoring visit, the NDOE team and Chuuk DOE also met with the Chuuk House of Senate Joint Committee of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) and Committee of Judiciary and Governmental Relations (JGR). These meeting opportunities provided insights to NDOE and Chuuk SPED in aligning improvement activities and targets to reflect the concerns and inputs from these stakeholders.

- On October 28, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SSIP meeting with all states and consultants from UOG CEDDERS and Sigma Associates, Inc., to further discuss State Logic Model and the LEA Local Systemic Improvement Plans (LSIP).
- On November 22-26, 2021, NDOE conducted the annual onsite verification and monitoring of Yap State Special Education program. NDOE monitoring team and Yap SPED key staffs met with the Yap Advisory Council and 42 parents and some of the discussion highlights were related to neighboring islands monitoring, the lack of certified or qualified special education teachers and specialists, how the parent survey is administered and access to program information and services. The team also met with the 10th Yap State Legislature to also present special education and related services and answer questions from the legislative members. The outcomes of these meeting also are included in Yap SPED discussions on its LPP/LSIP to ensure that improvement activities and target setting are all based on needs, recommendations, and actual program implementation practices.
- On December 8, 2021, NDOE conducted a virtual SPP/APR stakeholder meeting with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, and SAI on target setting, data verification, and program implementation practices. The LEA inputs from stakeholders during onsite verification and monitoring visits and public hearings were discussed during this virtual meeting.
- On January 5, 18, and 26, NDOE conducted virtual SPP/APR stakeholders meetings with all LEA leadership teams, UOG CEDDERS, SAI, and NCEO on data verification and target setting for both SEA and LEAs. During these SPP/APR final meetings, Chairmen of AC from some of the states attended and contributed to the discussions on indicator performances and target setting.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

Stakeholder input was built into review and revision of the evaluation for this next SSIP cycle. External evaluators continued the practice of convening state teams to review their data, compare to NDOE, and reflect on implementation challenges and successes, and plan for the coming school year. A series of stakeholder meetings were held between September and December 2021 during which State RTI teams reviewed their performance related to students' performance in reading, teachers' skills in implementing the reading programs, and family engagement in their early literacy initiatives. These RTI teams consist of school and State level members including principals, coaches, parent representatives, and administrators. Through focused discussions each team identified outcomes related to the SiMR that fit their State context.

In addition to State focused discussions and decision making, stakeholders provided input to NDOE outcomes and strategies to guide SSIP implementation. Through cross-State stakeholder discussions, NDOE was made aware of the challenges and needs for further TA/PD to support State implementation and scale up of RTI to sustain improved reading for students in the SSIP schools. In this way, stakeholders collaboratively engaged in development of FSM SSIP activities and outcomes.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Through the series of meetings with stakeholders, the opportunity to raise concern was built into the process. As RTI teams reflected on current implementation of their early literacy efforts, they identified challenges, and discussed reasonable expectations for target setting related to the SiMR. While not each and every concern was resolved, this information was used to plan TA/PD, and activities for the coming school year.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

N/A. No new activities planned for the next fiscal year.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

N/A. No new activities planned for the next fiscal year.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

While common forms and timelines for data collection are in place, there continues to be uneven adherence to the timelines. For example, coaching logs and set times for conducting school observations for evaluation purposes are articulated for the SSIP, these are not consistently provided on time. To address this and other aspects of the literacy coaching system, NDOE will work with TA partners to develop a standardized set of procedures and protocols for onboarding of new coaches as the early literacy practices are scaled up and sustained.

RTI teams noted that adequate time for reflection and action planning was a challenge to SSIP implementation. To address this, the external evaluators will conduct quarterly meetings with the NDOE liaisons so that RTI teams have frequent opportunities to meet and review data as a group in order to plan throughout the year. Meetings of all State RTI teams and NDOE staff will be held twice per year to ensure continued input to overall SSIP implementation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

FSM's FFY 2019 SPP/APR and Indicator 17 SSIP Phase III Year 5 report were sent to the four LEAs within the 120 days required after the date of the determination letter. Electronic copies of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR and the Indicator 17 SSIP included as a 508 compliant attachment were also sent to the four LEAs, as well as being posted on <https://www.fsmsped.org/resources/1/7> (SPP/APR) and <https://www.fsmsped.org/resources/1/9> (FFY 2019 SSIP Phase III Year 5, 508 Compliant).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

The FSM provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Arthur Albert

Title:

Assistant Secretary, Division of Special Services, FSM NDOE

Email:

aalbert@dss.edu.fm

Phone:

(691)320-8982

Submitted on:

04/28/22 9:15:34 PM