

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part B**

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

**For reporting on
FFY18**

Federated States of Micronesia



PART B DUE February 3, 2020

**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 2018. 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 2018 SPP/APR.

In FFY 2013, with input from stakeholders, FSM identified targets for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 for the SPP Results Indicators. Targets for Results Indicators 1 to 8 and 14-16 were established, in addition to targets set at 100% for Compliance Indicators 11 and 13. As per OSEP's instructions, the following Indicators do not apply to the FSM: 4B, 9, 10, and 12.

FSM's FFY 2018 APR includes performance for the 11 Results and 2 Compliance Indicators of the 16 SPP Indicator measures that apply to FSM and explanation of slippage for required Indicators that FSM's Targets were not met. FSM did not meet all Results indicator targets in FFY 2018. With stakeholder input, FSM maintained the same targets for the FFY 2019 APR results indicators, with the exception of Indicators 2, 7, and 14 based on trend data and baseline data established over different FFYs of the SPP/APR reporting cycles.

As per OSEP's instructions, for Indicator 17, FSM's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), FSM will submit its FFY 2018 performance and SSIP Phase III, Year Four, no later than April 1, 2020.

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 & Informal 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, disseminated and implemented in all four LEAs. NDOE also has in place a dispute resolution system that meets the IDEA Part B requirements 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 Basic Education and Accreditation meetings or workshops where issues affecting children with disabilities are discussed.

The LEA application 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 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, and national resources, including OSEP-funded centers, to support the LEA-specific and national technical assistance and training needs.

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 students 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 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, and 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 where 14 FSM scholars are attending. This bachelor's degree training will end in Spring 2021.

Stakeholder Involvement

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

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 2018 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 4 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On March 18-20, 2019, FSM National and State Leadership teams met in Pohnpei to finalize the FFY 2017 SSIP Phase III Year 3 for submission to OSEP on April 3, 2019. The meeting also included discussions on SPP and LPP related progresses and prioritization of areas for the next SSIP, focusing on areas requiring technical assistance for LEAs. Other stakeholders that attended this leadership meeting were general education teachers, specialists, and school administrators, and parents.
- On April 8-12, 2019, NDOE conducted onsite monitoring of Yap Special Education program and met with Yap Interagency team and 21 parents of children with disabilities, with 2 Yap Department of Health staffs and 1 Yap State Legislator. Discussion topics included parent rights, due process and mediation, Yap Special Education performance, budget, and 2019 Interagency conference to be hosted by Yap on August 5-9, 2019.
- On July 15-18, 2019, NDOE and Project LIFT consultant conducted a Coaches' Institute in conjunction with the 2019 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC) held in Pohnpei state. The Coaches' institute focused on professional development planning and implementation at the LEA levels, review and analysis of student data, classroom observation, core reading programs instruction/delivery, and presentations during MTEC break-out sessions. During the training, a Pohnpei Parent Evening was held at the model school where parents of children attending the Pohnpei Project LIFT model school and other school community parents were invited to participate in learning games with their kids. This opportunity allowed the parents and school community folks attending the event to learn more about Project LIFT and Special Education services in general.
- On August 5-9, 2019, the FSM Interagency conference was held in Yap and National and State administrators, general and special education teachers and administrators attending the conference met and discussed SPP and LPP implementation status, challenges, and preparation for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR Leadership meeting. FSM National and State Department of Health representatives and non-government agencies such as Chuuk and Pohnpei disability organization, Yap College of Micronesia campus, parents representing all four LEAs, were provided a Special Education program update and an opportunity to plan on improving each LEA's Interagency services for children with disabilities and their parents. The issue on

accessibility of built structures and educational environments and related services were prioritized for improvement in 2019-2020.

- On October 7-12, 2019, NDOE key staffs participated in a Pacific SSIP collaborative convening on Guam, with all the Pacific entities and OSEP funded TA centers such as National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO), National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL), with University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS) and the Regional Educational Laboratory-Pacific (REL-Pacific). FSM's Project LIFT consultants also attended to provide immediate consultative and technical assistance to FSM team represented by FSM National and all four state's DOE.
- On November 11-14, 2019, a pre-APR meeting was held on Pohnpei to continue discussions and analysis of FFY 2018 APR indicator performance data and identification of priorities for 2019-2020. State teams were represented by APR team members, who are representative of the broad stakeholders of each LEA. APR and SPP/SSIP data were presented and discussed for recommendations for improvement.
- On January 21-24, 2019, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team convened in Kosrae for final considerations for FSM's FFY 2018 APR, including explanation of slippage for FSM's FFY 2018 indicator performance that didn't meet target. The team reviewed FSM's performance on the established targets for Indicators 1-16 and discussed reasons for slippage where applicable. FSM's performance data were verified against all relevant data sources, including official 618 data submissions to OSEP. Trend data of performance on all indicator targets for FSM national and each LEA were reviewed and discussed for consideration of setting new targets or revising improvement activities.

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

YES

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 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 2017 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, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

As a unitary system, FSM reports annually to the public on the progress and/or slippage in meeting the 'measurable and rigorous targets' found in its SPP through posting its APR. FSM will post its SPP/APR annually within 120 days following FSM's submission of its SPP/APR, including any revisions if FSM has revised its SPP. FSM posts its complete SPP and all APRs on the following websites: <http://www.fsmsped.org/dashboard> and <http://www.national.doe.fm>.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

Federated States of Micronesia's (FSM) IDEA Part B determination for both 2018 and 2019 is Needs Assistance. In FSM's 2019 determination letter, the Department advised FSM of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State 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 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which FSM received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, FSM must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, FSM must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, FSM must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the FSM's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting FSM's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

FSM's 2019 Determination issued by USDOE OSEP on June 20, 2019 stated that FSM needs assistance in meeting requirements and purposes of IDEA Part B. The Determination letter 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. OSEP strongly encouraged FSM to access technical assistance related to those results elements and compliance indicators for which FSM received a score of zero. Further, OSEP required FSM to report with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which FSM received assistance; and (2) the actions FSM took as a result of that technical assistance.

Technical Assistance Sources from which FSM received assistance:

FSM received a score of zero for all results elements in its 2019 RDA matrix for assessment participation, graduation rates, and drop-out rates. FSM accessed available technical assistance through the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO), National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL), the Regional Educational Laboratory Pacific (REL-Pacific), and University of Guam CEDDERS. FSM engaged in national and regional training and institutes facilitated by these technical assistance centers, such as the October 2019 Pacific SSIP Collaborative held on Guam. In addition, FSM accessed technical assistance from University of Oregon, University of Minnesota Check & Connect Project, and Sigma Associates, Inc.

Actions FSM took as a result of that technical assistance:

Actions taken by the FSM as a result of the technical assistance received included furthering the support of FSM's SSIP implementation, which focuses on improving reading achievement. Other technical assistance resources accessed supported schools to develop and implement drop-out prevention strategies to reduce the number of drop-outs, and in turn, increase the number of graduates with a high school diploma.

FSM's SSIP & SiMR:

As per OSEP's instructions, for Indicator 17, FSM's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), FSM will submit its FFY 2018 performance and SSIP Phase III, Year Four report, no later than April 1, 2020.

Intro - OSEP Response

Federated States of Micronesia's (FSM) determinations for both 2018 and 2019 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 20, 2019 determination letter informed FSM that it must report with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which FSM received assistance; and (2) the actions FSM took as a result of that technical assistance. FSM provided the required information.

FSM were instructed to submit Phase III, Year Four, of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator B-17, by April 1, 2020. FSM provided the required information. FSM provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the target.

Intro - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, FSM must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, FSM, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, FSM must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since FSM's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the FSM's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

FSM's IDEA Part B determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In FSM's 2020 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 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which FSM received assistance; and (2) the actions 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) graduating from high school 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 of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2017	33.08%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	56.00%	62.00%	67.00%	72.00%	
Data	56.94%	93.22%	68.85%	73.85%	33.08%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	34.00%	34.00%

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 2018 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 4 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On March 18-20, 2019, FSM National and State Leadership teams met in Pohnpei to finalize the FFY 2017 SSIP Phase III Year 3 for submission to OSEP on April 3, 2019. The meeting also included discussions on SPP and LPP related progresses and prioritization of areas for the next SSIP, focusing on areas requiring technical assistance for LEAs. Other stakeholders that attended this leadership meeting were general education teachers, specialists, and school administrators, and parents.
- On April 8-12, 2019, NDOE conducted onsite monitoring of Yap Special Education program and met with Yap Interagency team and 21 parents of children with disabilities, with 2 Yap Department of Health staffs and 1 Yap State Legislator. Discussion topics included parent rights, due process and mediation, Yap Special Education performance, budget, and 2019 Interagency conference to be hosted by Yap on August 5-9, 2019.
- On July 15-18, 2019, NDOE and Project LIFT consultant conducted a Coaches' Institute in conjunction with the 2019 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC) held in Pohnpei state. The Coaches' institute focused on professional development planning and implementation at the LEA levels, review and analysis of student data, classroom observation, core reading programs instruction/delivery, and presentations during MTEC break-out sessions. During the training, a Pohnpei Parent Evening was held at the model school where parents of children attending the Pohnpei Project LIFT model school and other school community parents were invited to participate in learning games with their kids. This opportunity allowed the parents and school community folks attending the event to learn more about Project LIFT and Special Education services in general.
- On August 5-9, 2019, the FSM Interagency conference was held in Yap and National and State administrators, general and special education teachers and administrators attending the conference met and discussed SPP and LPP implementation status, challenges, and preparation for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR Leadership meeting. FSM National and State Department of Health representatives and non-government agencies such as Chuuk and Pohnpei disability organization, Yap College of Micronesia campus, parents representing all four LEAs, were provided a Special Education program update and an opportunity to plan on improving each LEA's Interagency services for children with disabilities and their parents. The issue on accessibility of built structures and educational environments and related services were prioritized for improvement in 2019-2020.
- On October 7-12, 2019, NDOE key staffs participated in a Pacific SSIP collaborative convening on Guam, with all the Pacific entities and OSEP funded TA centers such as National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO), National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), National Center on Intensive

Intervention (NCII), National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL), with University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS) and the Regional Educational Laboratory-Pacific (REL-Pacific). FSM's Project LIFT consultants also attended to provide immediate consultative and technical assistance to FSM team represented by FSM National and all four state's DOE.

- On November 11-14, 2019, a pre-APR meeting was held on Pohnpei to continue discussions and analysis of FFY 2018 APR indicator performance data and identification of priorities for 2019-2020. State teams were represented by APR team members, who are representative of the broad stakeholders of each LEA. APR and SPP/SSIP data were presented and discussed for recommendations for improvement.
- On January 21-24, 2019, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team convened in Kosrae for final considerations for FSM's FFY 2018 APR, including explanation of slippage for FSM's FFY 2018 indicator performance that didn't meet target. The team reviewed FSM's performance on the established targets for Indicators 1-16 and discussed reasons for slippage where applicable. FSM's performance data were verified against all relevant data sources, including official 618 data submissions to OSEP. Trend data of performance on all indicator targets for FSM national and each LEA were reviewed and discussed for consideration of setting new targets or revising improvement activities.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	40
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	115
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	34.78%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
40	115	33.08%	34.00%	34.78%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

Other

If extended, provide the number of years

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

"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

If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY 2017, OSEP required FSM to change its methodology for calculating graduation rates, which re-established FSM's baseline for Indicator 1. FSM uses the same data reported to the Department under Section 618 of IDEA to calculate its graduation rates.

Using one-year lag data, FSM's FFY 2018 Indicator 1 data were from the 2017-2018 IDEA exit data. FSM reports Indicator 1 percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited school due to receiving a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

FSM's total reported 618 exiters in 2017-2018 was 168; of which 115 left high school. In the FSM, elementary schools include grades through 8th grade,

which is the grade just before attending high school. FSM did not include exiters who left FSM's elementary schools.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

1 - OSEP Response

FSM provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (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 C009.

OPTION 2:

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 left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

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.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

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:

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 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2008	3.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	10.00%	9.00%	7.00%	5.00%	3.00%
Data	9.91%	22.69%	20.33%	4.14%	14.62%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	2.00%	2.90%

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 2018 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 4 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On March 18-20, 2019, FSM National and State Leadership teams met in Pohnpei to finalize the FFY 2017 SSIP Phase III Year 3 for submission to OSEP on April 3, 2019. The meeting also included discussions on SPP and LPP related progresses and prioritization of areas for the next SSIP, focusing on areas requiring technical assistance for LEAs. Other stakeholders that attended this leadership meeting were general education teachers, specialists, and school administrators, and parents.
- On April 8-12, 2019, NDOE conducted onsite monitoring of Yap Special Education program and met with Yap Interagency team and 21 parents of

children with disabilities, with 2 Yap Department of Health staffs and 1 Yap State Legislator. Discussion topics included parent rights, due process and mediation, Yap Special Education performance, budget, and 2019 Interagency conference to be hosted by Yap on August 5-9, 2019.

- On July 15-18, 2019, NDOE and Project LIFT consultant conducted a Coaches' Institute in conjunction with the 2019 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC) held in Pohnpei state. The Coaches' institute focused on professional development planning and implementation at the LEA levels, review and analysis of student data, classroom observation, core reading programs instruction/delivery, and presentations during MTEC break-out sessions. During the training, a Pohnpei Parent Evening was held at the model school where parents of children attending the Pohnpei Project LIFT model school and other school community parents were invited to participate in learning games with their kids. This opportunity allowed the parents and school community folks attending the event to learn more about Project LIFT and Special Education services in general.
- On August 5-9, 2019, the FSM Interagency conference was held in Yap and National and State administrators, general and special education teachers and administrators attending the conference met and discussed SPP and LPP implementation status, challenges, and preparation for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR Leadership meeting. FSM National and State Department of Health representatives and non-government agencies such as Chuuk and Pohnpei disability organization, Yap College of Micronesia campus, parents representing all four LEAs, were provided a Special Education program update and an opportunity to plan on improving each LEA's Interagency services for children with disabilities and their parents. The issue on accessibility of built structures and educational environments and related services were prioritized for improvement in 2019-2020.
- On October 7-12, 2019, NDOE key staffs participated in a Pacific SSIP collaborative convening on Guam, with all the Pacific entities and OSEP funded TA centers such as National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO), National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL), with University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS) and the Regional Educational Laboratory-Pacific (REL-Pacific). FSM's Project LIFT consultants also attended to provide immediate consultative and technical assistance to FSM team represented by FSM National and all four state's DOE.
- On November 11-14, 2019, a pre-APR meeting was held on Pohnpei to continue discussions and analysis of FFY 2018 APR indicator performance data and identification of priorities for 2019-2020. State teams were represented by APR team members, who are representative of the broad stakeholders of each LEA. APR and SPP/SSIP data were presented and discussed for recommendations for improvement.
- On January 21-24, 2019, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team convened in Kosrae for final considerations for FSM's FFY 2018 APR, including explanation of slippage for FSM's FFY 2018 indicator performance that didn't meet target. The team reviewed FSM's performance on the established targets for Indicators 1-16 and discussed reasons for slippage where applicable. FSM's performance data were verified against all relevant data sources, including official 618 data submissions to OSEP. Trend data of performance on all indicator targets for FSM national and each LEA were reviewed and discussed for consideration of setting new targets or revising improvement activities.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	40
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	13
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	112
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	3

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, provide justification for the changes below.

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

YES

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

NO

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

FSM chooses Option 2 to report Indicator 2 data. FSM does not report drop-out data to the Department under Title 1 of ESEA. FSM therefore continues to use the high school enrollment calculation to determine FSM's annual drop-out rate for youth with IEPs in high school. Data for this indicator are "one-year lag" data. FSM used the 2017-2018 high school drop-out and enrollment data to determine FSM's data for this FFY 2018 APR Indicator 2.

In 2017-2018, the total number of youth with IEPs in high school was 524; of which, 62 were youth with IEPs who dropped out from high school. FSM reported in its 618 exit data report 112 dropout students, which included all elementary and high school students ages 14-21. For Indicator 2, 62 was the number used as the numerator representing youth with IEPs who dropped out of high school. The total number of youth with IEPs enrolled in high school was 524, which was used as the denominator.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
62	524	14.62%	2.00%	11.83%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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 below.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

2 - OSEP Response

FSM provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate 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 FS185 and 188.

Measurement

B. 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. 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 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, 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.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall I	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B												
C												
D												
E												
F												
G												
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	54.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
A	Overall	41.00%	Actual	54.56%	50.09%	57.66%	56.63%	78.95%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					

C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	55.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
A	Overall	39.00%	Actual	55.28%	54.09%	55.76%	59.40%	77.46%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					

L			Target >=				
L			Actual				

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	B >=			
Reading	C >=			
Reading	D >=			
Reading	E >=			
Reading	F >=			
Reading	G >=			
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Overall	100.00%	100.00%
Math	B >=			
Math	C >=			
Math	D >=			
Math	E >=			
Math	F >=			
Math	G >=			
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

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 2018 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 4 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On March 18-20, 2019, FSM National and State Leadership teams met in Pohnpei to finalize the FFY 2017 SSIP Phase III Year 3 for submission to OSEP on April 3, 2019. The meeting also included discussions on SPP and LPP related progresses and prioritization of areas for the next SSIP, focusing on areas requiring technical assistance for LEAs. Other stakeholders that attended this leadership meeting were general education teachers, specialists, and school administrators, and parents.
- On April 8-12, 2019, NDOE conducted onsite monitoring of Yap Special Education program and met with Yap Interagency team and 21 parents of children with disabilities, with 2 Yap Department of Health staffs and 1 Yap State Legislator. Discussion topics included parent rights, due process and mediation, Yap Special Education performance, budget, and 2019 Interagency conference to be hosted by Yap on August 5-9, 2019.
- On July 15-18, 2019, NDOE and Project LIFT consultant conducted a Coaches' Institute in conjunction with the 2019 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC) held in Pohnpei state. The Coaches' institute focused on professional development planning and implementation at the LEA levels, review and analysis of student data, classroom observation, core reading programs instruction/delivery, and presentations during MTEC break-out sessions. During the training, a Pohnpei Parent Evening was held at the model school where parents of children attending the Pohnpei Project LIFT model school and other school community parents were invited to participate in learning games with their kids. This opportunity allowed the parents and school community folks attending the event to learn more about Project LIFT and Special Education services in general.
- On August 5-9, 2019, the FSM Interagency conference was held in Yap and National and State administrators, general and special education teachers and administrators attending the conference met and discussed SPP and LPP implementation status, challenges, and preparation for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR Leadership meeting. FSM National and State Department of Health representatives and non-government agencies such as Chuuk and Pohnpei disability organization, Yap College of Micronesia campus, parents representing all four LEAs, were provided a Special Education program

update and an opportunity to plan on improving each LEA's Interagency services for children with disabilities and their parents. The issue on accessibility of built structures and educational environments and related services were prioritized for improvement in 2019-2020.

- On October 7-12, 2019, NDOE key staffs participated in a Pacific SSIP collaborative convening on Guam, with all the Pacific entities and OSEP funded TA centers such as National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO), National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL), with University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS) and the Regional Educational Laboratory-Pacific (REL-Pacific). FSM's Project LIFT consultants also attended to provide immediate consultative and technical assistance to FSM team represented by FSM National and all four state's DOE.
- On November 11-14, 2019, a pre-APR meeting was held on Pohnpei to continue discussions and analysis of FFY 2018 APR indicator performance data and identification of priorities for 2019-2020. State teams were represented by APR team members, who are representative of the broad stakeholders of each LEA. APR and SPP/SSIP data were presented and discussed for recommendations for improvement.
- On January 21-24, 2019, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team convened in Kosrae for final considerations for FSM's FFY 2018 APR, including explanation of slippage for FSM's FFY 2018 indicator performance that didn't meet target. The team reviewed FSM's performance on the established targets for Indicators 1-16 and discussed reasons for slippage where applicable. FSM's performance data were verified against all relevant data sources, including official 618 data submissions to OSEP. Trend data of performance on all indicator targets for FSM national and each LEA were reviewed and discussed for consideration of setting new targets or revising improvement activities.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

NO

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs				201		128					125
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations				15		8					6
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations				103		105					28
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards				7		1					6

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs		176		200		128					125
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations		6		6		8					6
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations		95		111		100					30

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards		4		7		1					6

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	454	279	78.95%	100.00%	61.45%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	<p>FSM did not meet its target of 100% for Reading assessment and reported a slippage of 17.50% from 78.95% (330/418) in FFY 2017 to 61.45% (279/454) in FFY 2018.</p> <p>The FSM APR Leadership Team identified the following factors that contributed to the Indicator 3B Reading slippage:</p> <p>First, three of the four FSM States with outer islands did not meet FSM's target for FFY 2018 with Chuuk State at 33.76% (53/157), Pohnpei State with 70.54% (158/244), and Yap State at 85.71% (30/35). The team learned that the testing schedules were changed after the announcements were already made to the schools which impacted participation, especially for the outer islands.</p> <p>Secondly, two of the States with the lowest Indicator 3B Reading performance did not provide make up days for any student who missed the testing days.</p>
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	629	380	77.46%	100.00%	60.41%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	<p>FSM did not meet its target of 100% for Math assessment and reported a slippage by 17.05% from 77.46% (440/568) in FFY 2017 to 60.41% (380/629) in FFY 2018.</p> <p>The FSM APR Leadership Team identified the following factors that contributed to the Indicator 3B Math slippage:</p> <p>First, three of the four FSM States with outer islands did not meet FSM's target for FFY 2018 with Chuuk State at 37.25% (92/247), Pohnpei State with 68.84% (190/276), and Yap State at 84.91% (45/53). The team learned that the testing schedules were changed after the announcements were already made to the schools which impacted participation, especially for the outer islands.</p> <p>Secondly, two of the States with the lowest Indicator 3B Math performance did not provide make up days for any student who missed the testing days.</p>
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

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.

FSM's public reports of assessment results are posted on www.national.doe.fm/index.php/ndoe-public/education-statistics/nmct-results, www.fmsped.org/resources/1/7 and www.fmsped.org/resources/1/3.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3B - OSEP Response

FSM provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate 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 = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. 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 reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 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

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B												
C												
D												
E												
F												
G												
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	2.00%	4.00%	6.00%	8.00%	10.00%
A	Overall	7.00%	Actual	2.84%	3.31%	4.20%	1.05%	3.33%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					

C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	2.00%	4.00%	6.00%	8.00%	10.00%
A	Overall	3.00%	Actual	0.00%	2.05%	1.09%	1.06%	1.82%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					

H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	10.00%	10.00%
Reading	B >=			
Reading	C >=			
Reading	D >=			
Reading	E >=			
Reading	F >=			
Reading	G >=			
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Overall	10.00%	10.00%
Math	B >=			
Math	C >=			
Math	D >=			
Math	E >=			
Math	F >=			
Math	G >=			
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

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 2018 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 4 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On March 18-20, 2019, FSM National and State Leadership teams met in Pohnpei to finalize the FFY 2017 SSIP Phase III Year 3 for submission to OSEP on April 3, 2019. The meeting also included discussions on SPP and LPP related progresses and prioritization of areas for the next SSIP, focusing on areas requiring technical assistance for LEAs. Other stakeholders that attended this leadership meeting were general education teachers, specialists, and school administrators, and parents.

- On April 8-12, 2019, NDOE conducted onsite monitoring of Yap Special Education program and met with Yap Interagency team and 21 parents of children with disabilities, with 2 Yap Department of Health staffs and 1 Yap State Legislator. Discussion topics included parent rights, due process and mediation, Yap Special Education performance, budget, and 2019 Interagency conference to be hosted by Yap on August 5-9, 2019.
- On July 15-18, 2019, NDOE and Project LIFT consultant conducted a Coaches' Institute in conjunction with the 2019 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC) held in Pohnpei state. The Coaches' institute focused on professional development planning and implementation at the LEA levels, review and analysis of student data, classroom observation, core reading programs instruction/delivery, and presentations during MTEC break-out sessions. During the training, a Pohnpei Parent Evening was held at the model school where parents of children attending the Pohnpei Project LIFT model school and other school community parents were invited to participate in learning games with their kids. This opportunity allowed the parents and school community folks attending the event to learn more about Project LIFT and Special Education services in general.
- On August 5-9, 2019, the FSM Interagency conference was held in Yap and National and State administrators, general and special education teachers and administrators attending the conference met and discussed SPP and LPP implementation status, challenges, and preparation for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR Leadership meeting. FSM National and State Department of Health representatives and non-government agencies such as Chuuk and Pohnpei disability organization, Yap College of Micronesia campus, parents representing all four LEAs, were provided a Special Education program update and an opportunity to plan on improving each LEA's Interagency services for children with disabilities and their parents. The issue on accessibility of built structures and educational environments and related services were prioritized for improvement in 2019-2020.
- On October 7-12, 2019, NDOE key staffs participated in a Pacific SSIP collaborative convening on Guam, with all the Pacific entities and OSEP funded TA centers such as National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO), National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL), with University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS) and the Regional Educational Laboratory-Pacific (REL-Pacific). FSM's Project LIFT consultants also attended to provide immediate consultative and technical assistance to FSM team represented by FSM National and all four state's DOE.
- On November 11-14, 2019, a pre-APR meeting was held on Pohnpei to continue discussions and analysis of FFY 2018 APR indicator performance data and identification of priorities for 2019-2020. State teams were represented by APR team members, who are representative of the broad stakeholders of each LEA. APR and SPP/SSIP data were presented and discussed for recommendations for improvement.
- On January 21-24, 2019, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team convened in Kosrae for final considerations for FSM's FFY 2018 APR, including explanation of slippage for FSM's FFY 2018 indicator performance that didn't meet target. The team reviewed FSM's performance on the established targets for Indicators 1-16 and discussed reasons for slippage where applicable. FSM's performance data were verified against all relevant data sources, including official 618 data submissions to OSEP. Trend data of performance on all indicator targets for FSM national and each LEA were reviewed and discussed for consideration of setting new targets or revising improvement activities.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

NO

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned				124		114					40
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level				3		0					0
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level				11		9					4
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level				0		0					0

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned		105		124		109					42
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level		0		0		0					0
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level		2		1		3					1
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level		1		0		0					0

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	278	27	3.33%	10.00%	9.71%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	XXX
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		
G		XXX
H		XXX

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	380	8	1.82%	10.00%	2.11%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	XXX
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

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.

FSM's public reports of assessment results are posted on www.national.doe.fm/index.php/ndoe-public/education-statistics/nmct-results, www.fsmsped.org/resources/1/7 and www.fsmsped.org/resources/1/3.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3C - OSEP Response

FSM provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3C - 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 districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(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 = $\left[\frac{\text{# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs}}{\text{# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable)}} \right] \times 100$.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts 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 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions 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.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n 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 district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), 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	2005	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	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 2018 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 4 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On March 18-20, 2019, FSM National and State Leadership teams met in Pohnpei to finalize the FFY 2017 SSIP Phase III Year 3 for submission to OSEP on April 3, 2019. The meeting also included discussions on SPP and LPP related progresses and prioritization of areas for the next SSIP, focusing on areas requiring technical assistance for LEAs. Other stakeholders that attended this leadership meeting were general education teachers, specialists, and school administrators, and parents.
- On April 8-12, 2019, NDOE conducted onsite monitoring of Yap Special Education program and met with Yap Interagency team and 21 parents of children with disabilities, with 2 Yap Department of Health staffs and 1 Yap State Legislator. Discussion topics included parent rights, due process and mediation, Yap Special Education performance, budget, and 2019 Interagency conference to be hosted by Yap on August 5-9, 2019.
- On July 15-18, 2019, NDOE and Project LIFT consultant conducted a Coaches' Institute in conjunction with the 2019 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC) held in Pohnpei state. The Coaches' institute focused on professional development planning and implementation at the LEA levels, review and analysis of student data, classroom observation, core reading programs instruction/delivery, and presentations during MTEC break-out sessions. During the training, a Pohnpei Parent Evening was held at the model school where parents of children attending the Pohnpei Project LIFT model school and other school community parents were invited to participate in learning games with their kids. This opportunity allowed the parents and school community folks attending the event to learn more about Project LIFT and Special Education services in general.
- On August 5-9, 2019, the FSM Interagency conference was held in Yap and National and State administrators, general and special education teachers and administrators attending the conference met and discussed SPP and LPP implementation status, challenges, and preparation for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR Leadership meeting. FSM National and State Department of Health representatives and non-government agencies such as Chuuk and Pohnpei disability organization, Yap College of Micronesia campus, parents representing all four LEAs, were provided a Special Education program update and an opportunity to plan on improving each LEA's Interagency services for children with disabilities and their parents. The issue on accessibility of built structures and educational environments and related services were prioritized for improvement in 2019-2020.
- On October 7-12, 2019, NDOE key staffs participated in a Pacific SSIP collaborative convening on Guam, with all the Pacific entities and OSEP funded TA centers such as National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO), National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL), with University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS) and the Regional Educational Laboratory-Pacific (REL-Pacific). FSM's Project LIFT consultants also attended to provide immediate consultative and technical assistance to FSM team represented by FSM National and all four state's DOE.
- On November 11-14, 2019, a pre-APR meeting was held on Pohnpei to continue discussions and analysis of FFY 2018 APR indicator performance data and identification of priorities for 2019-2020. State teams were represented by APR team members, who are representative of the broad stakeholders of each LEA. APR and SPP/SSIP data were presented and discussed for recommendations for improvement.
- On January 21-24, 2019, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team convened in Kosrae for final considerations for FSM's FFY 2018 APR, including explanation of slippage for FSM's FFY 2018 indicator performance that didn't meet target. The team reviewed FSM's performance on the established targets for Indicators 1-16 and discussed reasons for slippage where applicable. FSM's performance data were verified against all relevant data sources, including official 618 data submissions to OSEP. Trend data of performance on all indicator targets for FSM national and each LEA were reviewed and discussed for consideration of setting new targets or revising improvement activities.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

NO

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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.

In 2017-2018, FSM reported "2" 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 1.31% (2/153). 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 2018 using FFY17- FFY18 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)

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

XXX

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.

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4A - OSEP Response

FSM provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, 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 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 districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that 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) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n 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 size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts 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 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions 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.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts 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 district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), 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.

NA

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

Per OSEP's instruction, Indicator 4B is not applicable to FSM.

Historical Data

Baseline	NA	NA			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Data	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	NA	NA

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

NA

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

NA

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	NA	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable

NA

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

NA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

NA

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NA

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 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.

NA

NA

If YES, select one of the following:

NA

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

NA

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.

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4B - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- 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

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

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

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	91.75%	92.00%	92.50%	92.75%	93.00%
A	93.00%	Data	95.31%	94.04%	94.41%	95.00%	93.72%
B	2005	Target <=	2.70%	2.20%	1.70%	1.20%	1.00%
B	0.00%	Data	0.99%	0.78%	0.31%	0.32%	0.35%
C	2005	Target <=	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%
C	7.00%	Data	2.87%	4.10%	3.66%	3.89%	5.24%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	93.50%	93.50%
Target B <=	0.00%	0.00%
Target C <=	3.00%	3.00%

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 2018 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 4 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On March 18-20, 2019, FSM National and State Leadership teams met in Pohnpei to finalize the FFY 2017 SSIP Phase III Year 3 for submission to OSEP on April 3, 2019. The meeting also included discussions on SPP and LPP related progresses and prioritization of areas for the next SSIP, focusing on areas requiring technical assistance for LEAs. Other stakeholders that attended this leadership meeting were general education teachers, specialists, and school administrators, and parents.
- On April 8-12, 2019, NDOE conducted onsite monitoring of Yap Special Education program and met with Yap Interagency team and 21 parents of children with disabilities, with 2 Yap Department of Health staffs and 1 Yap State Legislator. Discussion topics included parent rights, due process and mediation, Yap Special Education performance, budget, and 2019 Interagency conference to be hosted by Yap on August 5-9, 2019.
- On July 15-18, 2019, NDOE and Project LIFT consultant conducted a Coaches' Institute in conjunction with the 2019 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC) held in Pohnpei state. The Coaches' institute focused on professional development planning and implementation at the LEA levels, review and analysis of student data, classroom observation, core reading programs instruction/delivery, and presentations during MTEC break-out sessions. During the training, a Pohnpei Parent Evening was held at the model school where parents of children attending the Pohnpei Project LIFT

model school and other school community parents were invited to participate in learning games with their kids. This opportunity allowed the parents and school community folks attending the event to learn more about Project LIFT and Special Education services in general.

- On August 5-9, 2019, the FSM Interagency conference was held in Yap and National and State administrators, general and special education teachers and administrators attending the conference met and discussed SPP and LPP implementation status, challenges, and preparation for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR Leadership meeting. FSM National and State Department of Health representatives and non-government agencies such as Chuuk and Pohnpei disability organization, Yap College of Micronesia campus, parents representing all four LEAs, were provided a Special Education program update and an opportunity to plan on improving each LEA's Interagency services for children with disabilities and their parents. The issue on accessibility of built structures and educational environments and related services were prioritized for improvement in 2019-2020.
- On October 7-12, 2019, NDOE key staffs participated in a Pacific SSIP collaborative convening on Guam, with all the Pacific entities and OSEP funded TA centers such as National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO), National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL), with University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS) and the Regional Educational Laboratory-Pacific (REL-Pacific). FSM's Project LIFT consultants also attended to provide immediate consultative and technical assistance to FSM team represented by FSM National and all four state's DOE.
- On November 11-14, 2019, a pre-APR meeting was held on Pohnpei to continue discussions and analysis of FFY 2018 APR indicator performance data and identification of priorities for 2019-2020. State teams were represented by APR team members, who are representative of the broad stakeholders of each LEA. APR and SPP/SSIP data were presented and discussed for recommendations for improvement.
- On January 21-24, 2019, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team convened in Kosrae for final considerations for FSM's FFY 2018 APR, including explanation of slippage for FSM's FFY 2018 indicator performance that didn't meet target. The team reviewed FSM's performance on the established targets for Indicators 1-16 and discussed reasons for slippage where applicable. FSM's performance data were verified against all relevant data sources, including official 618 data submissions to OSEP. Trend data of performance on all indicator targets for FSM national and each LEA were reviewed and discussed for consideration of setting new targets or revising improvement activities.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	1,689
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	1,591
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	4
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	7
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	0
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 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

Provide an explanation below

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	1,591	1,689	93.72%	93.50%	94.20%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	4	1,689	0.35%	0.00%	0.24%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	85	1,689	5.24%	3.00%	5.03%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX
C	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

5 - OSEP Response

FSM provided targets for FFY 2019 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: Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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.

(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

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 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) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

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.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	75.00%	75.00%	80.00%	85.00%	88.00%
A	88.50%	Data	75.98%	67.67%	67.67%	82.39%	81.90%
B	2011	Target <=	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%
B	0.70%	Data	0.00%	2.26%	2.26%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	90.00%	90.00%
Target B <=	0.60%	0.60%

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 2018 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 4 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On March 18-20, 2019, FSM National and State Leadership teams met in Pohnpei to finalize the FFY 2017 SSIP Phase III Year 3 for submission to OSEP on April 3, 2019. The meeting also included discussions on SPP and LPP related progresses and prioritization of areas for the next SSIP, focusing on areas requiring technical assistance for LEAs. Other stakeholders that attended this leadership meeting were general education teachers, specialists, and school administrators, and parents.
- On April 8-12, 2019, NDOE conducted onsite monitoring of Yap Special Education program and met with Yap Interagency team and 21 parents of children with disabilities, with 2 Yap Department of Health staffs and 1 Yap State Legislator. Discussion topics included parent rights, due process and mediation, Yap Special Education performance, budget, and 2019 Interagency conference to be hosted by Yap on August 5-9, 2019.
- On July 15-18, 2019, NDOE and Project LIFT consultant conducted a Coaches' Institute in conjunction with the 2019 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC) held in Pohnpei state. The Coaches' institute focused on professional development planning and implementation at the LEA levels, review and analysis of student data, classroom observation, core reading programs instruction/delivery, and presentations during MTEC break-out

sessions. During the training, a Pohnpei Parent Evening was held at the model school where parents of children attending the Pohnpei Project LIFT model school and other school community parents were invited to participate in learning games with their kids. This opportunity allowed the parents and school community folks attending the event to learn more about Project LIFT and Special Education services in general.

- On August 5-9, 2019, the FSM Interagency conference was held in Yap and National and State administrators, general and special education teachers and administrators attending the conference met and discussed SPP and LPP implementation status, challenges, and preparation for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR Leadership meeting. FSM National and State Department of Health representatives and non-government agencies such as Chuuk and Pohnpei disability organization, Yap College of Micronesia campus, parents representing all four LEAs, were provided a Special Education program update and an opportunity to plan on improving each LEA's Interagency services for children with disabilities and their parents. The issue on accessibility of built structures and educational environments and related services were prioritized for improvement in 2019-2020.

- On October 7-12, 2019, NDOE key staffs participated in a Pacific SSIP collaborative convening on Guam, with all the Pacific entities and OSEP funded TA centers such as National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO), National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL), with University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS) and the Regional Educational Laboratory-Pacific (REL-Pacific). FSM's Project LIFT consultants also attended to provide immediate consultative and technical assistance to FSM team represented by FSM National and all four state's DOE.

- On November 11-14, 2019, a pre-APR meeting was held on Pohnpei to continue discussions and analysis of FFY 2018 APR indicator performance data and identification of priorities for 2019-2020. State teams were represented by APR team members, who are representative of the broad stakeholders of each LEA. APR and SPP/SSIP data were presented and discussed for recommendations for improvement.

- On January 21-24, 2019, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team convened in Kosrae for final considerations for FSM's FFY 2018 APR, including explanation of slippage for FSM's FFY 2018 indicator performance that didn't meet target. The team reviewed FSM's performance on the established targets for Indicators 1-16 and discussed reasons for slippage where applicable. FSM's performance data were verified against all relevant data sources, including official 618 data submissions to OSEP. Trend data of performance on all indicator targets for FSM national and each LEA were reviewed and discussed for consideration of setting new targets or revising improvement activities.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	72
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	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	59
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	0
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	0
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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	59	72	81.90%	90.00%	81.94%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	0	72	0.00%	0.60%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Provide reasons for slippage for A

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

6 - OSEP Response

FSM provided targets for FFY 2019 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

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2008	Target >=	83.00%	83.00%	83.00%	85.00%	85.00%
A1	79.50%	Data	83.82%	87.00%	80.60%	89.86%	100.00%
A2	2008	Target >=	71.00%	71.00%	71.00%	71.00%	71.00%
A2	65.00%	Data	71.62%	59.05%	54.88%	78.75%	79.31%
B1	2008	Target >=	78.00%	78.25%	78.25%	78.50%	78.50%
B1	80.00%	Data	78.57%	87.13%	85.53%	92.11%	96.55%
B2	2008	Target >=	62.00%	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%	65.00%
B2	65.00%	Data	62.16%	48.57%	51.22%	65.00%	58.62%
C1	2008	Target >=	85.00%	85.00%	86.00%	86.00%	87.00%
C1	87.00%	Data	85.00%	85.86%	86.57%	91.78%	92.86%
C2	2008	Target >=	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%
C2	68.30%	Data	75.68%	54.29%	59.76%	68.75%	62.07%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	85.00%	87.00%
Target A2 >=	71.00%	71.00%
Target B1 >=	80.25%	90.00%
Target B2 >=	65.25%	65.25%
Target C1 >=	87.25%	90.00%
Target C2 >=	75.00%	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 2018 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 4 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On March 18-20, 2019, FSM National and State Leadership teams met in Pohnpei to finalize the FFY 2017 SSIP Phase III Year 3 for submission to OSEP on April 3, 2019. The meeting also included discussions on SPP and LPP related progresses and prioritization of areas for the next SSIP, focusing on areas requiring technical assistance for LEAs. Other stakeholders that attended this leadership meeting were general education teachers, specialists, and school administrators, and parents.
- On April 8-12, 2019, NDOE conducted onsite monitoring of Yap Special Education program and met with Yap Interagency team and 21 parents of children with disabilities, with 2 Yap Department of Health staffs and 1 Yap State Legislator. Discussion topics included parent rights, due process and mediation, Yap Special Education performance, budget, and 2019 Interagency conference to be hosted by Yap on August 5-9, 2019.
- On July 15-18, 2019, NDOE and Project LIFT consultant conducted a Coaches' Institute in conjunction with the 2019 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC) held in Pohnpei state. The Coaches' institute focused on professional development planning and implementation at the LEA levels, review and analysis of student data, classroom observation, core reading programs instruction/delivery, and presentations during MTEC break-out sessions. During the training, a Pohnpei Parent Evening was held at the model school where parents of children attending the Pohnpei Project LIFT model school and other school community parents were invited to participate in learning games with their kids. This opportunity allowed the parents and school community folks attending the event to learn more about Project LIFT and Special Education services in general.
- On August 5-9, 2019, the FSM Interagency conference was held in Yap and National and State administrators, general and special education teachers and administrators attending the conference met and discussed SPP and LPP implementation status, challenges, and preparation for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR Leadership meeting. FSM National and State Department of Health representatives and non-government agencies such as Chuuk and Pohnpei disability organization, Yap College of Micronesia campus, parents representing all four LEAs, were provided a Special Education program update and an opportunity to plan on improving each LEA's Interagency services for children with disabilities and their parents. The issue on accessibility of built structures and educational environments and related services were prioritized for improvement in 2019-2020.
- On October 7-12, 2019, NDOE key staffs participated in a Pacific SSIP collaborative convening on Guam, with all the Pacific entities and OSEP funded

TA centers such as National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO), National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL), with University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS) and the Regional Educational Laboratory-Pacific (REL-Pacific). FSM's Project LIFT consultants also attended to provide immediate consultative and technical assistance to FSM team represented by FSM National and all four state's DOE.

- On November 11-14, 2019, a pre-APR meeting was held on Pohnpei to continue discussions and analysis of FFY 2018 APR indicator performance data and identification of priorities for 2019-2020. State teams were represented by APR team members, who are representative of the broad stakeholders of each LEA. APR and SPP/SSIP data were presented and discussed for recommendations for improvement.
- On January 21-24, 2019, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team convened in Kosrae for final considerations for FSM's FFY 2018 APR, including explanation of slippage for FSM's FFY 2018 indicator performance that didn't meet target. The team reviewed FSM's performance on the established targets for Indicators 1-16 and discussed reasons for slippage where applicable. FSM's performance data were verified against all relevant data sources, including official 618 data submissions to OSEP. Trend data of performance on all indicator targets for FSM national and each LEA were reviewed and discussed for consideration of setting new targets or revising improvement activities.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

32

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

	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	3.13%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	12	37.50%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	16	50.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3	9.38%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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>	28	29	100.00%	85.00%	96.55%	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>	19	32	79.31%	71.00%	59.38%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

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

	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	3.13%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	15	46.88%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	16	50.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	31	32	96.55%	80.25%	96.88%	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> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	16	32	58.62%	65.25%	50.00%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	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	0	0.00%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	13	40.63%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	18	56.25%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1	3.13%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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.	31	31	92.86%	87.25%	100.00%	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.	19	32	62.07%	75.00%	59.38%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	XXX
A2	<p>FSM did not meet its FFY 2018 targets for 7A2, 7B2, and 7C2, which report preschoolers with IEPs who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. FSM reported slippage by 19.93% for 7A2 from 79.31% (23/29) in FFY 2017 to 59.38% (19/32) in FFY 2018; by 8.62% for 7B2 from 58.62% (17/29) to 50.00% (16/32) in FFY 2018; and by 2.69% for 7C2 from 62.07% (18/29) in FFY 2017 to 59.38% (19/32) in FFY 2018.</p> <p>A data review of the preschoolers with an IEP who were in the "b" and "c" progress categories for Outcomes 7A2, 7B2, and 7C2 showed that the majority of these preschoolers were in both Outcomes "b" and "c" progress categories. In addition, the majority of these</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	<p>preschoolers exited to 1st grade with less than one year of preschool special education services. These preschoolers included those with autism spectrum disorder, orthopedic impairment, intellectual disability, hearing impairment, and developmental delay who required continued support for improving their knowledge and functional skills.</p> <p>Based on the data review, reasons for the slippage for the 7A2, 7B2, and 7C2 slippage could be attributed to the length of preschool special education services provided, which was less than one year, and their educational needs related to their disability.</p> <p>FSM continues to provide technical support and training to the FSM States/LEAs on the use of Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) process for both general and special education early childhood education teachers. The FSM ECO procedures were updated to include specific instructions to ensure the ECO process is implemented with fidelity across the FSM States/LEAs. The training also included activities related to understanding child development and developmentally appropriate preschool evidence-based practices.</p> <p>FSM National continues to support each FSM State/LEAs to conduct Child Find to ensure that young children with disabilities are identified, located, and evaluated as early as possible so that, if determined eligible, can receive preschool special education services. In collaboration with FSM Health Services and the FSM Hearing Detection and Intervention (EHDI) Program, FSM National continues to co-sponsor biennially the FSM Interagency Leadership Conference which rotates from state to state to build awareness about the early identification and service needs of young children with special needs. Hence, technical assistance for speech and hearing is currently on-going for service providers and families under the FSM EHDI Program to strengthen the identification and intervention services for children with hearing impairment and developmental delays.</p>
B1	XXX
B2	<p>FSM did not meet its FFY 2018 targets for 7A2, 7B2, and 7C2, which report preschoolers with IEPs who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. FSM reported slippage by 19.93% for 7A2 from 79.31% (23/29) in FFY 2017 to 59.38% (19/32) in FFY 2018; by 8.62% for 7B2 from 58.62% (17/29) to 50.00% (16/32) in FFY 2018; and by 2.69% for 7C2 from 62.07% (18/29) in FFY 2017 to 59.38% (19/32) in FFY 2018.</p> <p>A data review of the preschoolers with an IEP who were in the “b” and “c” progress categories for Outcomes 7A2, 7B2, and 7C2 showed that the majority of these preschoolers were in both Outcomes “b” and “c” progress categories. In addition, the majority of these preschoolers exited to 1st grade with less than one year of preschool special education services. These preschoolers included those with autism spectrum disorder, orthopedic impairment, intellectual disability, hearing impairment, and developmental delay who required continued support for improving their knowledge and functional skills.</p> <p>Based on the data review, reasons for the slippage for the 7A2, 7B2, and 7C2 slippage could be attributed to the length of preschool special education services provided, which was less than one year, and their educational needs related to their disability.</p> <p>FSM continues to provide technical support and training to the FSM States/LEAs on the use of Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) process for both general and special education early childhood education teachers. The FSM ECO procedures were updated to include specific instructions to ensure the ECO process is implemented with fidelity across the FSM States/LEAs. The training also included activities related to understanding child development and developmentally appropriate preschool evidence-based practices.</p> <p>FSM National continues to support each FSM State/LEAs to conduct Child Find to ensure that young children with disabilities are identified, located, and evaluated as early as possible so that, if determined eligible, can receive preschool special education services. In collaboration with FSM Health Services and the FSM Hearing Detection and Intervention (EHDI) Program, FSM National continues to co-sponsor biennially the FSM Interagency Leadership Conference which rotates from state to state to build awareness about the early identification and service needs of young children with special needs. Hence, technical assistance for speech and hearing is currently on-going for service providers and families under the FSM EHDI Program to strengthen the identification and intervention services for children with hearing impairment and developmental delays.</p>
C1	XXX
C2	<p>FSM did not meet its FFY 2018 targets for 7A2, 7B2, and 7C2, which report preschoolers with IEPs who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. FSM reported slippage by 19.93% for 7A2 from 79.31% (23/29) in FFY 2017 to 59.38% (19/32) in FFY 2018; by 8.62% for 7B2 from 58.62% (17/29) to 50.00% (16/32) in FFY 2018; and by 2.69% for 7C2 from 62.07% (18/29) in FFY 2017 to 59.38% (19/32) in FFY 2018.</p> <p>A data review of the preschoolers with an IEP who were in the “b” and “c” progress categories for Outcomes 7A2, 7B2, and 7C2 showed that the majority of these preschoolers were in both Outcomes “b” and “c” progress categories. In addition, the majority of these preschoolers exited to 1st grade with less than one year of preschool special education services. These preschoolers included those with autism spectrum disorder, orthopedic impairment, intellectual disability, hearing impairment, and developmental delay who required continued support for improving their knowledge and functional skills.</p> <p>Based on the data review, reasons for the slippage for the 7A2, 7B2, and 7C2 slippage could be attributed to the length of preschool special education services provided, which was less than one year, and their educational needs related to their disability.</p> <p>FSM continues to provide technical support and training to the FSM States/LEAs on the use of Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) process for both general and special education early childhood education teachers. The FSM ECO procedures were updated to include specific instructions to ensure the ECO process is implemented with fidelity across the FSM States/LEAs. The training also included activities related to understanding child development and developmentally appropriate preschool evidence-based practices.</p> <p>FSM National continues to support each FSM State/LEAs to conduct Child Find to ensure that young children with disabilities are identified, located, and evaluated as early as possible so that, if determined eligible, can receive preschool special education services. In collaboration with FSM Health Services and the FSM Hearing Detection and Intervention (EHDI) Program, FSM National continues to co-sponsor biennially the FSM Interagency Leadership Conference which rotates from state to state to build awareness about the early identification and service needs of young children with special needs. Hence, technical assistance for speech and hearing is currently on-</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	going for service providers and families under the FSM EHDI Program to strengthen the identification and intervention services for children with hearing impairment and developmental delays.

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

Please explain why the State did not 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
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

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

YES

If no, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."

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 National Department of Education (NDOE), Special Education Office 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

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

FSM provided targets for FFY 2019 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.

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

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the 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.

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

8 - Indicator Data

	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO
If yes, will you be providing the data for preschool children separately?	XXX

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 2018 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 4 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On March 18-20, 2019, FSM National and State Leadership teams met in Pohnpei to finalize the FFY 2017 SSIP Phase III Year 3 for submission to OSEP on April 3, 2019. The meeting also included discussions on SPP and LPP related progresses and prioritization of areas for the next SSIP, focusing on areas requiring technical assistance for LEAs. Other stakeholders that attended this leadership meeting were general education teachers, specialists, and school administrators, and parents.
- On April 8-12, 2019, NDOE conducted onsite monitoring of Yap Special Education program and met with Yap Interagency team and 21 parents of children with disabilities, with 2 Yap Department of Health staffs and 1 Yap State Legislator. Discussion topics included parent rights, due process and mediation, Yap Special Education performance, budget, and 2019 Interagency conference to be hosted by Yap on August 5-9, 2019.
- On July 15-18, 2019, NDOE and Project LIFT consultant conducted a Coaches' Institute in conjunction with the 2019 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC) held in Pohnpei state. The Coaches' institute focused on professional development planning and implementation at the LEA levels, review and analysis of student data, classroom observation, core reading programs instruction/delivery, and presentations during MTEC break-out sessions. During the training, a Pohnpei Parent Evening was held at the model school where parents of children attending the Pohnpei Project LIFT model school and other school community parents were invited to participate in learning games with their kids. This opportunity allowed the parents and school community folks attending the event to learn more about Project LIFT and Special Education services in general.
- On August 5-9, 2019, the FSM Interagency conference was held in Yap and National and State administrators, general and special education teachers and administrators attending the conference met and discussed SPP and LPP implementation status, challenges, and preparation for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR Leadership meeting. FSM National and State Department of Health representatives and non-government agencies such as Chuuk and Pohnpei disability organization, Yap College of Micronesia campus, parents representing all four LEAs, were provided a Special Education program update and an opportunity to plan on improving each LEA's Interagency services for children with disabilities and their parents. The issue on accessibility of built structures and educational environments and related services were prioritized for improvement in 2019-2020.
- On October 7-12, 2019, NDOE key staffs participated in a Pacific SSIP collaborative convening on Guam, with all the Pacific entities and OSEP funded TA centers such as National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO), National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL), with University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS) and the Regional Educational Laboratory-Pacific (REL-Pacific). FSM's Project LIFT consultants

also attended to provide immediate consultative and technical assistance to FSM team represented by FSM National and all four state's DOE.

- On November 11-14, 2019, a pre-APR meeting was held on Pohnpei to continue discussions and analysis of FFY 2018 APR indicator performance data and identification of priorities for 2019-2020. State teams were represented by APR team members, who are representative of the broad stakeholders of each LEA. APR and SPP/SSIP data were presented and discussed for recommendations for improvement.
- On January 21-24, 2019, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team convened in Kosrae for final considerations for FSM's FFY 2018 APR, including explanation of slippage for FSM's FFY 2018 indicator performance that didn't meet target. The team reviewed FSM's performance on the established targets for Indicators 1-16 and discussed reasons for slippage where applicable. FSM's performance data were verified against all relevant data sources, including official 618 data submissions to OSEP. Trend data of performance on all indicator targets for FSM national and each LEA were reviewed and discussed for consideration of setting new targets or revising improvement activities.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	39.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	59.00%	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%	63.00%
Data	59.19%	58.58%	59.23%	67.49%	61.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	64.00%	64.00%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
934	1,692	61.00%	64.00%	55.20%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

1,716

Percentage of respondent parents

98.60%

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

FSM's FFY 2018 performance of 55.20% (934/1692) represents slippage by 5.8% from 61.00% (1134/1859) in FFY 2017. Stakeholders, including representatives from the State/LEA Special Education Advisory Councils who supported the dissemination of the parent surveys, discussed two possible reasons for the slippage: Understanding the survey item and increased awareness by parents of what to expect. It was shared that there appeared to be a need to have a clear understanding of the survey item by both parents and conductor of the survey. For instance, understanding the survey item statement and consistent clarifying questions (probes) across interviewers are needed to ensure parents understand what the item is talking about. Also, it was discussed that parent training activities have increased awareness of parents about parental involvement. The high response rate of 98.60% (1692/1716) might be an indication of increased expectations for parental involvement.

Stakeholders discussed ways to address the slippage and to ensure that schools are facilitating parental involvement for improving special education services. One of the priorities discussed is for training sessions to target those schools or regions that reported a low performance rate for the survey item used to determine parental involvement. Each State/LEA special education program will plan for collaborative school personnel and parent sessions in these schools or regions to build awareness and capacity for schools to facilitate parental involvement.

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 2018 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.

Data Calculation Method. FSM used the same adapted ECO survey as in previous years. There is a total of six questions in the "FSM Parent Survey" related to parent involvement in their child's education as a means of improving the services and results for children with disabilities. The six survey items request parents to choose one of three response categories: 1) satisfied/understood/included; 2) somewhat/ sometimes; or 3) not enough or

never. Survey Item #1 asks the following: Have you been included as a full partner in making decisions about your child's special education program? A response of "included" in the first response category for Survey Item #1 was used as the numerator to determine the percentage of parent respondents who reported that school facilitated parental involvement.

Data Collection Method: As in previous years, each FSM State/LEA facilitated the data collection process for disseminating and collecting the parent surveys from parents of children with an IEP at the preschool, elementary, and secondary levels:

Yap State continued to work closely with their Inter-Agency Council members and representatives of their parent organization to support the dissemination and completion of the parent surveys by parents of children with an IEP. The surveys were completed one-on-one via an interview process, including for parents in the outer islands. This resulted in a 100% (159/159) return rate from Yap State.

In Kosrae State, the Inter-Agency Council members and Special Education Program staff disseminated and collected the parent surveys. As needed, they assisted parents in completing the parent survey. This resulted in a 97.99% (146/149) survey return rate for Kosrae State.

Chuuk State continued to work directly with the school principals and teachers, including the special education teachers, in the dissemination and collection of the parent surveys. The Special Education Case Managers collected the completed surveys for the schools. Chuuk State reported a 100% (709/709) survey return rate.

Pohnpei State worked with her Special Education Advisory Council, School Principals, Education Administrators, and National Special Education Office to disseminate and collect the parent surveys from the schools. The annual public hearing was one of the events for disseminating and collecting the parent surveys. This resulted in a 97% (678/699) return rate.

In all four LEAs, parents were given the option of having the surveys in their native language or in English or to have the survey read to them in their vernacular language to increase their understanding of the survey questions.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Preschool	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
Preschool	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	XXX	XXX
Target B >=	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately

	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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

The number of School-Age parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

XXX

Percentage of respondent School-Age parents

XXX

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If yes, provide sampling plan.	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

	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.	XXX
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	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.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

FSM's FFY 2018 response rate of 98.60% (1692/1716) represents an increase in response rate from 98.15% (1859/1894) in FFY 2017. By numbers, the difference between the surveys not completed from year to year was an improvement from 35 surveys not completed in FFY 2017 to 24 surveys not completed in FFY 2018. The overall number of respondents is significant given the geographic remoteness of some areas within the FSM. All four island states or LEAs reported a high percentage of returned surveys, with two states/LEAs returning 100% of the surveys and the other two states/LEAs reporting at least a 97% return rate. FSM, therefore, demonstrated geographic, ethnic, and racial representation in respondents for its FFY 2018 parent survey compared to the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

FSM provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

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 FFY 2018, 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 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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.

NA

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Per OSEP's instruction, Indicator 9 is not applicable to FSM.

Historical Data

Baseline	NA	NA			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Data	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	NA	NA

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

NA

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

NA

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	NA	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

NA

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

NA

Define “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).

NA

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.

NA

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

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 2018, 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 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 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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.

NA

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

Per OSEP's instruction, Indicator 10 is not applicable to FSM.

Historical Data

Baseline	NA	NA			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Data	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	NA	NA

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

NA

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

NA

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	NA	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

NA

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

NA

Define "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).

NA

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

NA

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

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

- # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- # 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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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	2005	95.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	96.62%	99.07%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
291	284	100.00%	100%	97.59%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

In FFY 2018, FSM reported 97.59% (284/291) significant compliance for Indicator 11, which represented seven initial evaluations over timeline. The number of days beyond the timeline for all seven initial evaluations was 1- 22 days over the 60-day timeline requirement. It should be noted that although late, all seven initial evaluations were completed over timeline, as indicated in the "Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b)" section of this Indicator. The reason for the delay was due to non-adherence to the FSM Special Education Procedures, where teachers reported uncertain of who is responsible for each IEP process steps.

During the FSM SPP/APR Leadership Meeting, stakeholders from the National and State Special Education Programs, including the Special Education

Coordinator from each FSM state, discussed how to address the timeliness of the initial evaluations. It was agreed that the FSM State Special Education Coordinators will regularly review the information on the required procedural timeline reports generated by the FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS) to determine the needs of the evaluators to complete the initial evaluations on time. The SITS reports include date of referral and date of parent consent so the Special Education Coordinators would be able to determine the deadline for the 60-day timeline. A follow-up training session on the FSM Special Education Procedural Manual was requested for all the four FSM LEAs.

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

7

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.

The range of days beyond the timeline for the seven initial evaluations completed over timeline included:

Range of Days Over Timeline and # of Initial Evaluations Over Timeline

- 1 day - 3
- 8 days - 1
- 19 days - 1
- 20 days -1
- 22 days -1

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

What is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

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, 2018 to June 30, 2019. 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 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

Because FSM reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, it must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, FSM must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 SPP/APR, FSM must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If FSM did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why FSM did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

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

- # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- # 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.
- # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- # 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.

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.

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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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.

NA

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Per OSEP's instruction, Indicator 12 is not applicable to FSM. FSM does not receive IDEA Part C funding.

Historical Data

Baseline	NA	NA			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Data	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	NA	NA

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	NA
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	NA
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	NA

d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	NA
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	NA
f. Number 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.	NA

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
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.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

NA

Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f

NA

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.

NA

Attach PDF table (optional)

NA

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

NA

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.

NA

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

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: Secondary transition: 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 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 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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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	2009	88.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
337	337	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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, 2018 to June 30, 2019. 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.

	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 yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	

If no, please explain

FSM chooses to continue reporting Indicator 13 data for youth aged 16 and above with IEPs. FSM may choose in the new SPP cycle to include youth younger than aged 16 with an IEP to ensure early transition skill development opportunities are provided for a meaningful transition from school to post-school activities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

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: Post-school outcomes: Percent 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.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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 = [(# 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) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# 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) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] 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 = [(# 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) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] 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 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 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” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

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, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). 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

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.

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 analysis 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 and 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.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target >=	7.00%	9.00%	11.00%	13.00%	14.00%
A	13.00%	Data	7.69%	3.38%	10.38%	22.22%	23.19%
B	2009	Target >=	35.00%	40.00%	45.00%	50.00%	55.00%
B	26.00%	Data	50.43%	20.95%	40.57%	40.28%	46.38%
C	2009	Target >=	58.00%	60.00%	62.00%	64.00%	68.00%
C	34.00%	Data	66.67%	58.78%	90.57%	83.33%	100.00%

FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	14.00%	15.00%
Target B >=	60.00%	50.00%
Target C >=	70.00%	80.00%

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 2018 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 4 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On March 18-20, 2019, FSM National and State Leadership teams met in Pohnpei to finalize the FFY 2017 SSIP Phase III Year 3 for submission to OSEP on April 3, 2019. The meeting also included discussions on SPP and LPP related progresses and prioritization of areas for the next SSIP, focusing on areas requiring technical assistance for LEAs. Other stakeholders that attended this leadership meeting were general education teachers, specialists, and school administrators, and parents.
- On April 8-12, 2019, NDOE conducted onsite monitoring of Yap Special Education program and met with Yap Interagency team and 21 parents of children with disabilities, with 2 Yap Department of Health staffs and 1 Yap State Legislator. Discussion topics included parent rights, due process and mediation, Yap Special Education performance, budget, and 2019 Interagency conference to be hosted by Yap on August 5-9, 2019.
- On July 15-18, 2019, NDOE and Project LIFT consultant conducted a Coaches' Institute in conjunction with the 2019 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC) held in Pohnpei state. The Coaches' institute focused on professional development planning and implementation at the LEA levels, review and analysis of student data, classroom observation, core reading programs instruction/delivery, and presentations during MTEC break-out sessions. During the training, a Pohnpei Parent Evening was held at the model school where parents of children attending the Pohnpei Project LIFT model school and other school community parents were invited to participate in learning games with their kids. This opportunity allowed the parents and school community folks attending the event to learn more about Project LIFT and Special Education services in general.
- On August 5-9, 2019, the FSM Interagency conference was held in Yap and National and State administrators, general and special education teachers and administrators attending the conference met and discussed SPP and LPP implementation status, challenges, and preparation for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR Leadership meeting. FSM National and State Department of Health representatives and non-government agencies such as Chuuk and Pohnpei disability organization, Yap College of Micronesia campus, parents representing all four LEAs, were provided a Special Education program

update and an opportunity to plan on improving each LEA's Interagency services for children with disabilities and their parents. The issue on accessibility of built structures and educational environments and related services were prioritized for improvement in 2019-2020.

- On October 7-12, 2019, NDOE key staffs participated in a Pacific SSIP collaborative convening on Guam, with all the Pacific entities and OSEP funded TA centers such as National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO), National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL), with University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS) and the Regional Educational Laboratory-Pacific (REL-Pacific). FSM's Project LIFT consultants also attended to provide immediate consultative and technical assistance to FSM team represented by FSM National and all four state's DOE.

- On November 11-14, 2019, a pre-APR meeting was held on Pohnpei to continue discussions and analysis of FFY 2018 APR indicator performance data and identification of priorities for 2019-2020. State teams were represented by APR team members, who are representative of the broad stakeholders of each LEA. APR and SPP/SSIP data were presented and discussed for recommendations for improvement.

- On January 21-24, 2019, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team convened in Kosrae for final considerations for FSM's FFY 2018 APR, including explanation of slippage for FSM's FFY 2018 indicator performance that didn't meet target. The team reviewed FSM's performance on the established targets for Indicators 1-16 and discussed reasons for slippage where applicable. FSM's performance data were verified against all relevant data sources, including official 618 data submissions to OSEP. Trend data of performance on all indicator targets for FSM national and each LEA were reviewed and discussed for consideration of setting new targets or revising improvement activities.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	110
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	23
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	19
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)	6
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).	59

	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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	23	110	23.19%	14.00%	20.91%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	42	110	46.38%	60.00%	38.18%	Did Not Meet Target	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)	107	110	100.00%	70.00%	97.27%	Met Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	FSM did not meet its target for 14B of 60% and reported slippage by 8.20% from 46.38% (32/69) in FFY 2017 to 38.18% (42/110) in FFY 2018. By numbers, there was an increase by 10 leavers reported in 14B from 32 leavers who were in higher education or competitively employed in FFY 2017 to 42 in FFY 2018.

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	Stakeholders from Pohnpei State and Yap State reported that the On-the-Job Training (OJT) program in these two LEAs stopped at the high school. This program offered all high school seniors an opportunity to explore jobs as part of their high school curriculum, which increased the likelihood of these seniors being employed upon graduation. In Pohnpei State, this could have contributed to the decrease in the number of leavers in competitive employment from seven in FFY 2017 to two in FFY 2018. In Chuuk, 64.81% (35/54) represented leavers in "other employment" from the lagoon and outer islands. There are limited opportunities for competitive employment on these islands where the leavers reside, which could have contributed to the slippage for 14B.
C	XXX

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.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If yes, provide sampling plan.	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, attach a copy of the survey	XXX

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.

FSM demonstrated representation of its demographics with a 97.35% (110/113) return rate of its FFY 2017 leavers responding to the post-school outcome survey in FFY 2018. In 2017-2018, there was a total of 168 exiters; of which, 115 exiters left high school: 40 graduates with a high school diploma; 62 who dropped out; 11 who reached maximum age; and 2 who died. Of the 115 exiters who left high school, 113 were considered leavers for the purposes of Indicator 14: post-school outcomes survey.

Analysis of representation included response rate by FSM States/LEAs, disability, and gender. All four LEAs were represented in the leaver respondents, with Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap reporting 100% response rate. Chuuk reported a response rate of 94.74% (54/57). The three leavers from Chuuk State who did not complete the survey were from a lagoon island.

Overall, by disability, the majority in both the leaver and respondent groups was SLD: Leavers = 92.92% (105/113) and Respondents = 93.64% (103/110); similar representation.

Overall, by gender, there was a similar representation in males in both groups: Leavers = 32.74% (37/113) and Respondents = 30.91% (34/110).

Data Collection Methods: FSM National Department of Education (NDOE), the SEA, and the four islands states, the LEAs, continue to monitor the implementation of the secondary transition policies and procedures, including when and how the post-school outcome surveys are completed. Each LEA gathers post-school outcome data annually between April and September for all youth with IEPs who received special education services and who graduated with a high school diploma, dropped out, withdrew or reached maximum age during the previous school year, consistent with the reported IDEA 618 exit data.

The collection of the post-school outcome data are conducted by each LEA and transmitted to FSM-NDOE for compilation and verification of the students who exited the program in the previous school year to ensure that the required "leavers" are surveyed and reported in the APR. Data are reviewed by the data managers at each LEA to ensure the data are accurate prior to reporting to FSM-NDOE. In addition, the LEA special education coordinator signs a certification document confirming the accuracy of the data submitted to FSM-NDOE.

	Yes / No
Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

FSM provided targets for FFY 2019 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 ED Facts 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, targets and improvement activities, 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 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	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

Provide an explanation below.

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 2018 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 4 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On March 18-20, 2019, FSM National and State Leadership teams met in Pohnpei to finalize the FFY 2017 SSIP Phase III Year 3 for submission to OSEP on April 3, 2019. The meeting also included discussions on SPP and LPP related progresses and prioritization of areas for the next SSIP, focusing on areas requiring technical assistance for LEAs. Other stakeholders that attended this leadership meeting were general education teachers, specialists, and school administrators, and parents.
- On April 8-12, 2019, NDOE conducted onsite monitoring of Yap Special Education program and met with Yap Interagency team and 21 parents of children with disabilities, with 2 Yap Department of Health staffs and 1 Yap State Legislator. Discussion topics included parent rights, due process and mediation, Yap Special Education performance, budget, and 2019 Interagency conference to be hosted by Yap on August 5-9, 2019.
- On July 15-18, 2019, NDOE and Project LIFT consultant conducted a Coaches' Institute in conjunction with the 2019 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC) held in Pohnpei state. The Coaches' institute focused on professional development planning and implementation at the LEA levels, review and analysis of student data, classroom observation, core reading programs instruction/delivery, and presentations during MTEC break-out sessions. During the training, a Pohnpei Parent Evening was held at the model school where parents of children attending the Pohnpei Project LIFT model school and other school community parents were invited to participate in learning games with their kids. This opportunity allowed the parents and school community folks attending the event to learn more about Project LIFT and Special Education services in general.
- On August 5-9, 2019, the FSM Interagency conference was held in Yap and National and State administrators, general and special education teachers and administrators attending the conference met and discussed SPP and LPP implementation status, challenges, and preparation for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR Leadership meeting. FSM National and State Department of Health representatives and non-government agencies such as Chuuk and

Pohnpei disability organization, Yap College of Micronesia campus, parents representing all four LEAs, were provided a Special Education program update and an opportunity to plan on improving each LEA's Interagency services for children with disabilities and their parents. The issue on accessibility of built structures and educational environments and related services were prioritized for improvement in 2019-2020.

- On October 7-12, 2019, NDOE key staffs participated in a Pacific SSIP collaborative convening on Guam, with all the Pacific entities and OSEP funded TA centers such as National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO), National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL), with University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS) and the Regional Educational Laboratory-Pacific (REL-Pacific). FSM's Project LIFT consultants also attended to provide immediate consultative and technical assistance to FSM team represented by FSM National and all four state's DOE.
- On November 11-14, 2019, a pre-APR meeting was held on Pohnpei to continue discussions and analysis of FFY 2018 APR indicator performance data and identification of priorities for 2019-2020. State teams were represented by APR team members, who are representative of the broad stakeholders of each LEA. APR and SPP/SSIP data were presented and discussed for recommendations for improvement.
- On January 21-24, 2019, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team convened in Kosrae for final considerations for FSM's FFY 2018 APR, including explanation of slippage for FSM's FFY 2018 indicator performance that didn't meet target. The team reviewed FSM's performance on the established targets for Indicators 1-16 and discussed reasons for slippage where applicable. FSM's performance data were verified against all relevant data sources, including official 618 data submissions to OSEP. Trend data of performance on all indicator targets for FSM national and each LEA were reviewed and discussed for consideration of setting new targets or revising improvement activities.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005				
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				N/A	N/A

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FSM did not hold any hearing resolution sessions during the historical data period. Per the Measurement instructions, States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

15 - OSEP Response

FSM reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2018. 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 resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, 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 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	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

Provide an explanation below

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 2018 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III Year 4 report (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On March 18-20, 2019, FSM National and State Leadership teams met in Pohnpei to finalize the FFY 2017 SSIP Phase III Year 3 for submission to OSEP on April 3, 2019. The meeting also included discussions on SPP and LPP related progresses and prioritization of areas for the next SSIP, focusing on areas requiring technical assistance for LEAs. Other stakeholders that attended this leadership meeting were general education teachers, specialists, and school administrators, and parents.
- On April 8-12, 2019, NDOE conducted onsite monitoring of Yap Special Education program and met with Yap Interagency team and 21 parents of children with disabilities, with 2 Yap Department of Health staffs and 1 Yap State Legislator. Discussion topics included parent rights, due process and mediation, Yap Special Education performance, budget, and 2019 Interagency conference to be hosted by Yap on August 5-9, 2019.
- On July 15-18, 2019, NDOE and Project LIFT consultant conducted a Coaches' Institute in conjunction with the 2019 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC) held in Pohnpei state. The Coaches' institute focused on professional development planning and implementation at the LEA levels, review and analysis of student data, classroom observation, core reading programs instruction/delivery, and presentations during MTEC break-out sessions. During the training, a Pohnpei Parent Evening was held at the model school where parents of children attending the Pohnpei Project LIFT model school and other school community parents were invited to participate in learning games with their kids. This opportunity allowed the parents and school community folks attending the event to learn more about Project LIFT and Special Education services in general.
- On August 5-9, 2019, the FSM Interagency conference was held in Yap and National and State administrators, general and special education teachers

and administrators attending the conference met and discussed SPP and LPP implementation status, challenges, and preparation for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR Leadership meeting. FSM National and State Department of Health representatives and non-government agencies such as Chuuk and Pohnpei disability organization, Yap College of Micronesia campus, parents representing all four LEAs, were provided a Special Education program update and an opportunity to plan on improving each LEA's Interagency services for children with disabilities and their parents. The issue on accessibility of built structures and educational environments and related services were prioritized for improvement in 2019-2020.

- On October 7-12, 2019, NDOE key staffs participated in a Pacific SSIP collaborative convening on Guam, with all the Pacific entities and OSEP funded TA centers such as National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO), National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL), with University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS) and the Regional Educational Laboratory-Pacific (REL-Pacific). FSM's Project LIFT consultants also attended to provide immediate consultative and technical assistance to FSM team represented by FSM National and all four state's DOE.
- On November 11-14, 2019, a pre-APR meeting was held on Pohnpei to continue discussions and analysis of FFY 2018 APR indicator performance data and identification of priorities for 2019-2020. State teams were represented by APR team members, who are representative of the broad stakeholders of each LEA. APR and SPP/SSIP data were presented and discussed for recommendations for improvement.
- On January 21-24, 2019, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team convened in Kosrae for final considerations for FSM's FFY 2018 APR, including explanation of slippage for FSM's FFY 2018 indicator performance that didn't meet target. The team reviewed FSM's performance on the established targets for Indicators 1-16 and discussed reasons for slippage where applicable. FSM's performance data were verified against all relevant data sources, including official 618 data submissions to OSEP. Trend data of performance on all indicator targets for FSM national and each LEA were reviewed and discussed for consideration of setting new targets or revising improvement activities.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005				
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=		

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				N/A	N/A

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FSM did not hold any mediations during the historical data period. Per the Measurement instructions, States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

16 - OSEP Response

FSM reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2018. FSM is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - 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:

Arthurson Albert

Title:

Assistant Secretary/Part B Director

Email:

aalbert@dss.edu.fm; aduralbert7@gmail.com

Phone:

(691)320-8982

Submitted on: