

# **STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B**

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

**For reporting on  
FFY 2022**

**Federated States of Micronesia**



**PART B DUE February 1, 2024**

**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 2022. 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 2022 SPP/APR.

This FFY 2022 SPP/APR includes FFY 2020 to FFY 2025 targets established with input from stakeholders in FFY 2020. Targets for Results Indicators 1 to 8 and 14-16 were established, with consideration of rigor and achievability. As required, Targets for Compliance Indicators 11 and 13 are set at 100%. As per OSEP's instructions, the following Indicators do not apply to the FSM: 4B, 9, 10, and 12.

FSM's FFY 2022 APR includes performance for the 11 Results and 2 Compliance Indicators of the 16 SPP Indicator measures that apply to FSM and required explanation of slippage for Indicators that FSM Targets were not met. FSM did not meet (how many) Results indicator targets in FFY 2022.

As per OSEP's instructions, for Indicator 17, FSM's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), FSM is submitting its FFY 2022 performance and SSIP Phase III, along with the APR Indicators on this submission on February 1, 2024.

#### Additional information related to data collection and reporting

#### Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

1

#### General Supervision System:

**The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).**

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

FSM's administrative structure for the implementation of IDEA Part B requirements includes the NDOE as the SEA and the four FSM islands states as the LEAs. NDOE has three organizational divisions, Division of Formal & Non-Formal Education (DF&NF), Division of Quality & Effectiveness (DQ&E), and Division of Special Services (DSS). 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 (2012) and FSM Special Education Procedural Safeguards Notice (2011), consistent with the IDEA Part B requirements that were disseminated and implemented in all four LEAs. NDOE also has in place a dispute resolution system that meets the IDEA Part B requirements that were disseminated and implemented in each LEA.

As the SEA, NDOE assures that the IDEA procedural requirements are being met in each LEA. NDOE has developed and implemented a Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS, 2007) 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 23-01, 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. FSM is revising its CIMS to align with OSEP DMS 2.0 requirements.

Consistent with OSEP Memo 23-01, 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, evidence-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 face-to-face and virtual leadership meetings, such as SPP/APR and SSIP meetings and NDOE Divisions of Formal and Non-Formal Education and Quality and Effectiveness meetings or workshops where issues affecting children with disabilities are discussed. In addition, NDOE and Division of Special Services are actively

engaged with international and regional development partners in coordinating and facilitation of trainings and technical supports in early childhood development to teachers, both general and special education, at the LEA level.

The LEA application for IDEA Part B funding includes the development and implementation of a Local Performance Plan (LPP) that is aligned to the FSM SPP and developed with stakeholder input. Each LEA has in place a special education advisory council or an inter-agency council that meets the membership requirements of the IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education. The LEA special education advisory council reviews LEA data and performance on the FSM SPP indicator measures and provides input to LEA target setting and development and implementation of improvement activities. They are also invited and engaged in stakeholder meetings at the LEA and SEA levels to identify root causes of issues and explanation of slippages on reporting indicators. The advisory council and the LEA Director of Education 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 convening 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 reviewed LEA LPP data and information for technical assistance and training implementation and needs. The teams identify LEA-specific needs and national initiatives for allocating resources. NDOE also serves as the conduit for accessing local, regional, international, and national resources, including OSEP-funded centers, to support the LEA-specific and national technical assistance and training needs.

For this reporting period, the APR and SPP/SSIP Leadership meetings were held both face-to-face in three separate times. During this reporting period, COVID-19 is no longer a nation-wide health threat and travel is no longer restricted. However, during the beginning of the school year, when the government and school were transitioning back to normal operation, some training activities and support services were not fully implemented. Some training consultants were not able to enter for fear of extended border closure. Thus, this report includes a period when no onsite technical assistances were provided later toward the middle of this reporting year. FSM DSS had continued to participate in many virtual calls with technical assistance providers to ensure services are still being planned and implemented where and when possible to children with disabilities and services providers. FSM school calendars are back on regular face-to-face instructions, but with continued pre-cautionary measures still in place to ensure a ready and efficient transition back to an altered schedule in case a new strand of the corona virus of 2019 is detected on any one of the LEA. Technical assistance providers from mainland US and Guam assisted to facilitate onsite and virtual leadership meetings with LEA stakeholders to discuss priorities and TA deliveries.

#### **Professional Development System:**

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

Given FSM's unique geographic context, NDOE has mechanisms in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide special education and related services that improve results for children with disabilities. With input from the LEAs, NDOE establishes the minimum professional standards and assessment for the certification of all public school teachers and the content standards and assessment for all students. In addition, FSM Public Law 8-132 (1995) amended Title 40 of the FSM code and requires all schools in the FSM to meet required minimum standards and undergo a process of accreditation. The law requires the following criteria for accreditation of elementary and secondary schools: Philosophy, goals, and objectives; Organization; Staff and teachers; School plan and physical facilities; Library; Student counseling services; Curricular program; Co-curricular program; Community and parent involvement; Finance; Student-teacher ratio; and Compliance with the minimum standards established by and under these and other regulations. The purpose of FSM's accreditation is to ensure all schools provide all students, inclusive of those with disabilities, 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. Recent annual and periodical accreditation of all public schools are including review of IEP records, placement of students, and accessibility of instructions and built structures.

FSM's Project LIFT (Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow) is an ongoing major National Initiative 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 had started with one model school in each of the four LEAs 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 these model schools for student screening and assessment, student progress monitoring, and research based instructional intervention programs for improving literacy skills for children in early childhood education (ECE) through fifth grade. For this reporting period, two of the LEAs had started scaling out to two new schools and have been providing trainings to principals and teachers on effective methods of implementing the RTI reading method.

NDOE, FSM's conduit for accessing local, regional, and national resources, has engaged in several OSEP-funded regional professional development grants to improve the knowledge and skills of service providers working with children with disabilities. The Pacific Assessment Consortium (PAC6) served to support the development and implementation of FSM's Alternate Assessment based on Alternate Achievement Standards (AA-AAS), which included teacher training. The Pacific Consortium for Instructional Materials Accessibility Project (Pacific CIMAP) provided technical support and training for teachers and related service personnel to ensure children with print disabilities have the required timely accessible materials. The Pacific Vision Instruction Project (Pacific VIP), an OSEP personnel preparation grant, is another regional project with the outcome of developing personnel in the area of vision education and orientation and mobility for providing educational services for children with visual impairments. These OSEP-funded grants, to name a few, have had significant impact on FSM's personnel capacity to provide appropriate services for children with disabilities. In 2017, the College of the Marshall Islands partnered with University of Hawaii at Manoa Center on Disabilities Studies to deliver a bachelor's degree training program on Deaf Education and Severe Disabilities. This project, titled Navigating Student Success in the Pacific (NSSP), resulted in 13 FSM scholars completing their bachelor and/or advanced certification program in Spring 2021. These 13 FSM scholars remain in their respective LEAs (1 in Chuuk, 2 in Kosrae, 6 in Pohnpei, and 4 in Yap) serving as special education teachers, related service assistants, or special education specialists.

NDOE's two new personnel development projects funded by US DOE OSEP, titled Certificate in Educational Leadership, Policy, and Practice (CELPP)

and CURRENT, rolled out in 2020 and 2021, respectively, are intended to improve the skills of teachers and education leaders to better improve results for children with disabilities throughout the FSM school system. First cohort of 8 CELPP scholars completed the first year of effective leadership training in December 2022 and will begin year 2 training in January 2023, while the second cohort is expected to be selected in January 2023. Project CURRENT developed a survey designed for all special education teachers, principals, and service providers in the FSM to gather relevant information from key stakeholders to assist FSM in the development of a comprehensive retention plan.

FSM's ongoing participation and membership of regional and other OSEP funded center and consulting groups have been used as platforms to share personnel development needs and assistances. Trainings, workshops, and information sharing held in the FSM during this reporting year were outcomes of meetings (virtual and face to face) with IDC, NCSI, Guam CEDDERS, UH Manoa Center for Disability Studies (CDS), and others.

#### **Stakeholder Engagement:**

**The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates and solicits broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. The FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team is comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs, including LEA general education administrators. This leadership team serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development and this meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. In addition, the FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow (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).

NDOE facilitated public hearing in all four LEAs to present FFY2023 IDEA Part B grant application and other special education program information with parents, service providers, and the wider community. Although no policies and procedures were revised requiring public awareness and input, the public hearing opportunities allowed the parents and community members to learn about their respective Local Performance Plan (LPP) and accomplishments and challenges. Input from the audiences were documented and considered by each LEA and the SEA in the development of the new LPP or the SPP and APR.

A summary of the public hearings held at the LEAs are as follows:

1. Chuuk State: May 10-11, 2023 on the islands of Kuchua, Tonoas and Fonomo, Udot. There were a total of 114 participants with 60 parents, 42 service providers, and 12 students.
2. Kosrae State: May 11, 2023 at Tofol, Lelu (capital of Kosrae and all four municipals were invited/participated). Total of 70 participants, with 33 parents and 37 service providers.
3. Pohnpei State: May 15-17, 2023 at Enipein, Kitti, Nett, and Saladak, U. Total of 233 participants, with 160 parents and 73 service providers.
4. Yap State: May 13 & 15, 2023 at Ablul, Tomil and Dinay, Rull. Total of 96 participants, with 38 parents, 24 service providers, and 34 students.

For the development of FSM's FFY 2022 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP (Indicator 17) report, NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

1. On July 5 & 6, 2023, NDOE Coordinators and LEA Coordinators and key staffs and Guam CEDDERS consultants convened in Kosrae during the 2023 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC). Meeting outcomes included initial discussion and planning on the FFY23 SPP/APR, agreement and finalization of the 2023-2024 LPP and quarterly reporting requirements and template, further revisions on the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) procedures, planned next steps for the USDOE OSEP DMS visit, and prioritized SEA and LEA areas for improvement.
2. On August 21-25, 2023, National Coordinators, Guam CEDDERS, State Education Directors, and CELPP scholars and mentors met in Kosrae for a CELPP summer institute. 8 CELPP scholars completed the 2-year training with a capstone project to develop a leadership portfolio. As a training requirement, all scholars learn about the NDOE SPP and APR and each develop a research project that were presented at this summer institute. All presentations were documented and recommendations were considered at the SEA as well as LEA level and during the preparation of this FFY23 SPP/APR.
3. On September 11-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR and Project LIFT leadership teams convened in Chuuk for the first formal FFY23 SPP/APR meeting. At this convening, the applicable Indicator performance data were collected from each LEA and compiled into a draft FFY23 SPP/APR report. In addition, the OSEP DMS 2.0 monitoring framework and protocols were presented to these two leadership teams. Other meeting outcomes include discussions on the interim data collection process and tools, onsite verification and monitoring schedule of LEAs, continued revisions on the CIMS, overview of indicator measurements and related instructions on data collection and analysis. UOG CEDDERS consultants provided onsite Project LIFT TA to Chuuk and presented FSM LIFT status and calendaring of onsite TA to other LEAs. Participants to this meeting included UOG CEDDERS consultants (3), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (19), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (7), and Yap State (8). The 45 participants included Advisory Chairpersons/parents, Director of Education and General Education Administrators/Specialists and Classroom Teachers. On September 13, 2023 from 2-4pm, NDOE (1), Chuuk Special Education (2), Kosrae DOE (1), and UOG CEDDERS (1) met with private school principals and key staffs (6) to present and held an open discussions on parentally-placed private school children with disabilities.
4. December 12-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held second meeting in Pohnpei. Meeting outcomes were first draft of FSM FFY23 SPP/APR completed and incomplete data and slippage notes presented by LEAs, CIMS procedures further discussed in relation to General Supervision and implementation implications beginning 2023-2024, further discussions and preparations on the DMS 2.0 calendar and expectations, prioritization of improvement activities under the SPP/APR, Project LIFT, and other national and state priorities. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultant (1), NDOE staff (8), Chuuk State (9), Kosrae State (9), Pohnpei State (15), and Yap State (6). Among these participants from the states were 2 Advisory Chairpersons, 4 DOE Administrators, and 2 DOE Specialists.
5. On January 24-26, 2024, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held its final meeting in Pohnpei to confirm and verify all indicator performance data and explanation of slippage for required indicators, agreement on Indicator 17 data and implications on SSIP and local systemic improvement plan priorities and improvement activities, and finalize national and state-level focused areas for improvement. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultants (2), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (6), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (11), and Yap State (6). Among these state participants were 3 Advisory Chairpersons and 1 DOE Administrator.

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

YES

**Number of Parent Members:**

**Parent Members Engagement:**

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

There are State Advisory Councils (SAC) in all four FSM states. In one LEA (Kosrae State), the Interagency Council is the council that plays the same role of the SAC. The SAC in each LEA work closely with the Special Education program in representing parents and their respective communities in planning and advising the program in delivery of services. The SAC officers and members are included in the LEA exercises to develop annual Local Performance Plans (LPP) and Local Systemic Improvement Plan (LSIP) which also required the signature of the Chairman or a designated representative on the final plan which include both the LPP and the LSIP and the proposed budget for the new fiscal year. In all face-to-face meetings leading up to the final FSM FFY 2023 APR, LEA SAC members have been involved in all meetings and they were engaged in analyzing data and setting targets for the SEA as well as each LEA.

**Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

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

The impact of the second strain of COVID-19 virus on the islands after borders were opened and schools went back to normal schedule had some effect on planned activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities on the islands. Although the virus was still spreading in the communities, NDOE went ahead and worked with LEAs and scheduled public hearing on the FFY2023 IDEA Part B application and other workshop meetings with parents. The public hearings held in each LEA are reported in this section as being held on each of the four FSM states as follows: Chuuk State on May 10-11, 2023 on two lagoon islands; Kosrae State on May 11, 2023 at the capitol of the state; Pohnpei State on May 15-17, 2023 in four municipalities; and Yap State on May 13 & 15, 2023 in two municipalities. Except for Kosrae, the public hearings were held in municipalities or communities that have not been visited in the past years.

On August 14-16, 2023, parents were invited and joined General Education and Special Education administrators and teachers in a training titled "Promoting Progress for All Students" co-facilitated by UOG CEDDERS and Progress Center. On December 1, 2023, parents of children with autism were also invited to and participated in a training on "Best Practices in Interventions for Young Children with ASD". This training was intended for service providers and a separate session was held with only parents. 15 parents attended session for parents only and 2 parents attended session for service providers.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

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

The mechanisms that exist to support soliciting public input in the process of APR and SSIP are the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS), requiring SEA to conduct one annual onsite verification and monitoring of each LEA and to conduct two off-site monitoring in one year. A focused-onsite verification and monitoring visit may be conducted based on the unique need of a state that has been monitored. Each LEA include SAC members in their onsite monitoring to ensure they are aware and can help to confirm services being provided to students, among many other things. The ongoing activities related to offsite technical assistance and virtual meetings with LEA Special Education Coordinators and SAC representatives were held. In addition, the public hearing held in the four LEAs during the latter part of this reporting year provided the opportunity to solicit input from the public that helped to shape how our targets and improvement strategies were established. The outcomes of the offsite monitoring reports, which would involve the participation of SAC or parent representatives, were used in setting targets, improvement strategies, and practical evaluation activities to ensure progress for both SEA and LEA plans. The LEA LPP/LSIP are presented at the three (3) APR/SSIP National Leadership meetings indicated in this section and all four LEA performances, challenges, success, were reviewed and analyzed to set the appropriate improvement activities, targets, and monitoring or evaluation processes for the following cycle.

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

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

Following the requirements of OSEP, the final FFY 2022 APR/SSIP will be made available to the public after both reports are determined final by OSEP. Electronic copies of the FFY 2022 APR/SSIP will be sent to LEA Directors of Education, Special Education Coordinators, and Advisory Council Chairperson. The reports will then be posted on the NDOE website at <https://www.national.doe.fm/education-reports/>.

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 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 2021 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.**

The final copy of the approved FSM FFY 2022 SPP/APR will be posted no later than 120 days following FSM's submission of its FFY 2022 APR at the FSM DOE website at <https://www.national.doe.fm/education-reports/>.

**Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**Intro - OSEP Response****Intro - Required Actions**

## Indicator 1: Graduation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	33.08%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=		34.00%	34.00%	50.00%	65.00%
Data	33.08%	34.78%	39.81%	59.02%	66.67%

### Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	67.00%	67.00%	70.00%	75.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates and solicits broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. The FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team is comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs, including LEA general education administrators. This leadership team serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development and this meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. In addition, the FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow (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).

NDOE facilitated public hearing in all four LEAs to present FFY2023 IDEA Part B grant application and other special education program information with parents, service providers, and the wider community. Although no policies and procedures were revised requiring public awareness and input, the public hearing opportunities allowed the parents and community members to learn about their respective Local Performance Plan (LPP) and accomplishments and challenges. Input from the audiences were documented and considered by each LEA and the SEA in the development of the new LPP or the SPP and APR.

A summary of the public hearings held at the LEAs are as follows:

1. Chuuk State: May 10-11, 2023 on the islands of Kuchua, Tonoas and Fonomo, Udot. There were a total of 114 participants with 60 parents, 42 service providers, and 12 students.
2. Kosrae State: May 11, 2023 at Tofol, Lelu (capital of Kosrae and all four municipals were invited/participated). Total of 70 participants, with 33 parents and 37 service providers.
3. Pohnpei State: May 15-17, 2023 at Enipein, Kitti, Nett, and Saladak, U. Total of 233 participants, with 160 parents and 73 service providers.
4. Yap State: May 13 & 15, 2023 at Ablul, Tomil and Dinay, Rull. Total of 96 participants, with 38 parents, 24 service providers, and 34 students.

For the development of FSM's FFY 2022 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP (Indicator 17) report, NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

1. On July 5 & 6, 2023, NDOE Coordinators and LEA Coordinators and key staffs and Guam CEDDERS consultants convened in Kosrae during the

2023 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC). Meeting outcomes included initial discussion and planning on the FFY23 SPP/APR, agreement and finalization of the 2023-2024 LPP and quarterly reporting requirements and template, further revisions on the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) procedures, planned next steps for the USDOE OSEP DMS visit, and prioritized SEA and LEA areas for improvement.

2. On August 21-25, 2023, National Coordinators, Guam CEDDERS, State Education Directors, and CELPP scholars and mentors met in Kosrae for a CELPP summer institute. 8 CELPP scholars completed the 2-year training with a capstone project to develop a leadership portfolio. As a training requirement, all scholars learn about the NDOE SPP and APR and each develop a research project that were presented at this summer institute. All presentations were documented and recommendations were considered at the SEA as well as LEA level and during the preparation of this FFY23 SPP/APR.

3. On September 11-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR and Project LIFT leadership teams convened in Chuuk for the first formal FFY23 SPP/APR meeting. At this convening, the applicable Indicator performance data were collected from each LEA and compiled into a draft FFY23 SPP/APR report. In addition, the OSEP DMS 2.0 monitoring framework and protocols were presented to these two leadership teams. Other meeting outcomes include discussions on the interim data collection process and tools, onsite verification and monitoring schedule of LEAs, continued revisions on the CIMS, overview of indicator measurements and related instructions on data collection and analysis. UOG CEDDERS consultants provided onsite Project LIFT TA to Chuuk and presented FSM LIFT status and calendaring of onsite TA to other LEAs. Participants to this meeting included UOG CEDDERS consultants (3), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (19), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (7), and Yap State (8). The 45 participants included Advisory Chairpersons/parents, Director of Education and General Education Administrators/Specialists and Classroom Teachers. On September 13, 2023 from 2-4pm, NDOE (1), Chuuk Special Education (2), Kosrae DOE (1), and UOG CEDDERS (1) met with private school principals and key staffs (6) to present and held an open discussions on parentally-placed private school children with disabilities.

4. December 12-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held second meeting in Pohnpei. Meeting outcomes were first draft of FSM FFY23 SPP/APR completed and incomplete data and slippage notes presented by LEAs, CIMS procedures further discussed in relation to General Supervision and implementation implications beginning 2023-2024, further discussions and preparations on the DMS 2.0 calendar and expectations, prioritization of improvement activities under the SPP/APR, Project LIFT, and other national and state priorities. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultant (1), NDOE staff (8), Chuuk State (9), Kosrae State (9), Pohnpei State (15), and Yap State (6). Among these participants from the states were 2 Advisory Chairpersons, 4 DOE Administrators, and 2 DOE Specialists.

5. On January 24-26, 2024, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held its final meeting in Pohnpei to confirm and verify all indicator performance data and explanation of slippage for required indicators, agreement on Indicator 17 data and implications on SSIP and local systemic improvement plan priorities and improvement activities, and finalize national and state-level focused areas for improvement. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultants (2), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (6), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (11), and Yap State (6). Among these state participants were 3 Advisory Chairpersons and 1 DOE Administrator.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	53
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	15
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	52

#### FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
53	120	66.67%	67.00%	44.17%	Did not meet target	Slippage

#### Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

During the 2021-2022 period, FSM's borders were still "closed" to commercial travel. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic continued with many parents strongly hesitant to send their children to school and left them home doing home chores and other home related duties, which could have attributed to the slippage in graduation rates with an increase in students dropping out of school.

**Graduation Conditions**

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

“Graduation with a high school diploma” is defined in the FSM as the completion of required course credits during high school, with each FSM State establishing the required total number of course credits to complete. The following are the graduation requirements for high school credits for each state: Chuuk = 22 credits; Kosrae = 24 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.

Further, in Kosrae, in order to achieve a diploma of graduation, students at Kosrae High School must obtain a minimum of 24 credits during the four year program and have a 2.00 or above grade point average (GPA) for their high school career. Any students with a GPA less than 2.00 will not graduate and have to repeat. This also applies to students with and without disabilities.

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

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**1 - OSEP Response**

**1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	37.70%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	3.00%	2.00%	2.90%	37.70%	35.00%
Data	14.62%	11.83%	10.47%	37.70%	29.49%

### Targets

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates and solicits broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. The FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team is comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs, including LEA general education administrators. This leadership team serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development and this meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. In addition, the FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow (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).

NDOE facilitated public hearing in all four LEAs to present FFY2023 IDEA Part B grant application and other special education program information with parents, service providers, and the wider community. Although no policies and procedures were revised requiring public awareness and input, the public hearing opportunities allowed the parents and community members to learn about their respective Local Performance Plan (LPP) and accomplishments and challenges. Input from the audiences were documented and considered by each LEA and the SEA in the development of the new LPP or the SPP and APR.

A summary of the public hearings held at the LEAs are as follows:

1. Chuuk State: May 10-11, 2023 on the islands of Kuchua, Tonoas and Fonomo, Udot. There were a total of 114 participants with 60 parents, 42 service providers, and 12 students.
2. Kosrae State: May 11, 2023 at Tofol, Lelu (capital of Kosrae and all four municipalities were invited/participated). Total of 70 participants, with 33 parents and 37 service providers.
3. Pohnpei State: May 15-17, 2023 at Enipein, Kitti, Nett, and Saladak, U. Total of 233 participants, with 160 parents and 73 service providers.
4. Yap State: May 13 & 15, 2023 at Ablul, Tomil and Dinay, Rull. Total of 96 participants, with 38 parents, 24 service providers, and 34 students.

For the development of FSM's FFY 2022 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP (Indicator 17) report, NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

1. On July 5 & 6, 2023, NDOE Coordinators and LEA Coordinators and key staffs and Guam CEDDERS consultants convened in Kosrae during the 2023 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC). Meeting outcomes included initial discussion and planning on the FFY23 SPP/APR, agreement and finalization of the 2023-2024 LPP and quarterly reporting requirements and template, further revisions on the Continuous Improvement

Monitoring System (CIMS) procedures, planned next steps for the USDOE OSEP DMS visit, and prioritized SEA and LEA areas for improvement.

2. On August 21-25, 2023, National Coordinators, Guam CEDDERS, State Education Directors, and CELPP scholars and mentors met in Kosrae for a CELPP summer institute. 8 CELPP scholars completed the 2-year training with a capstone project to develop a leadership portfolio. As a training requirement, all scholars learn about the NDOE SPP and APR and each develop a research project that were presented at this summer institute. All presentations were documented and recommendations were considered at the SEA as well as LEA level and during the preparation of this FFY23 SPP/APR.

3. On September 11-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR and Project LIFT leadership teams convened in Chuuk for the first formal FFY23 SPP/APR meeting. At this convening, the applicable Indicator performance data were collected from each LEA and compiled into a draft FFY23 SPP/APR report. In addition, the OSEP DMS 2.0 monitoring framework and protocols were presented to these two leadership teams. Other meeting outcomes include discussions on the interim data collection process and tools, onsite verification and monitoring schedule of LEAs, continued revisions on the CIMS, overview of indicator measurements and related instructions on data collection and analysis. UOG CEDDERS consultants provided onsite Project LIFT TA to Chuuk and presented FSM LIFT status and calendaring of onsite TA to other LEAs. Participants to this meeting included UOG CEDDERS consultants (3), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (19), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (7), and Yap State (8). The 45 participants included Advisory Chairpersons/parents, Director of Education and General Education Administrators/Specialists and Classroom Teachers. On September 13, 2023 from 2-4pm, NDOE (1), Chuuk Special Education (2), Kosrae DOE (1), and UOG CEDDERS (1) met with private school principals and key staffs (6) to present and held an open discussions on parentally-placed private school children with disabilities.

4. December 12-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held second meeting in Pohnpei. Meeting outcomes were first draft of FSM FFY23 SPP/APR completed and incomplete data and slippage notes presented by LEAs, CIMS procedures further discussed in relation to General Supervision and implementation implications beginning 2023-2024, further discussions and preparations on the DMS 2.0 calendar and expectations, prioritization of improvement activities under the SPP/APR, Project LIFT, and other national and state priorities. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultant (1), NDOE staff (8), Chuuk State (9), Kosrae State (9), Pohnpei State (15), and Yap State (6). Among these participants from the states were 2 Advisory Chairpersons, 4 DOE Administrators, and 2 DOE Specialists.

5. On January 24-26, 2024, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held its final meeting in Pohnpei to confirm and verify all indicator performance data and explanation of slippage for required indicators, agreement on Indicator 17 data and implications on SSIP and local systemic improvement plan priorities and improvement activities, and finalize national and state-level focused areas for improvement. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultants (2), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (6), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (11), and Yap State (6). Among these state participants were 3 Advisory Chairpersons and 1 DOE Administrator.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	53
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	15
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	52

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
52	120	29.49%	35.00%	43.33%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

During the 2021-2022 period, FSM's borders were still "closed" to commercial travel. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic continued with many parents strongly hesitant to send their children to school and left them home doing home chores and other home related duties, which could have attributed to the increase in students dropping out of school.

It should be noted that of the 52 exiters who dropped out in 2021-2022, seven returned to school the following school year.

**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. Each LEA established the number of unexcused absences in a school year differently and they are as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

NO

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

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## **2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **2 - OSEP Response**

## **2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

### 3A - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

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

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 6	65.00%	70.00%	75.00%	80.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	55.00%	60.00%	65.00%	70.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	65.00%	70.00%	75.00%	80.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	55.00%	60.00%	65.00%	70.00%

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates and solicits broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. The FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team is comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs, including LEA general education administrators. This leadership team serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development and this meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. In addition, the FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow (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).

NDOE facilitated public hearing in all four LEAs to present FFY2023 IDEA Part B grant application and other special education program information with parents, service providers, and the wider community. Although no policies and procedures were revised requiring public awareness and input, the public hearing opportunities allowed the parents and community members to learn about their respective Local Performance Plan (LPP) and accomplishments and challenges. Input from the audiences were documented and considered by each LEA and the SEA in the development of the new LPP or the SPP and APR.

A summary of the public hearings held at the LEAs are as follows:

1. Chuuk State: May 10-11, 2023 on the islands of Kuchua, Tonoas and Fonomo, Udot. There were a total of 114 participants with 60 parents, 42 service providers, and 12 students.
2. Kosrae State: May 11, 2023 at Tofol, Lelu (capital of Kosrae and all four municipals were invited/participated). Total of 70 participants, with 33 parents and 37 service providers.
3. Pohnpei State: May 15-17, 2023 at Enipein, Kittu, Nett, and Saladak, U. Total of 233 participants, with 160 parents and 73 service providers.
4. Yap State: May 13 & 15, 2023 at Ablul, Tomil and Dinay, Rull. Total of 96 participants, with 38 parents, 24 service providers, and 34 students.

For the development of FSM's FFY 2022 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP (Indicator 17) report, NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

1. On July 5 & 6, 2023, NDOE Coordinators and LEA Coordinators and key staffs and Guam CEDDERS consultants convened in Kosrae during the 2023 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC). Meeting outcomes included initial discussion and planning on the FFY23 SPP/APR, agreement and finalization of the 2023-2024 LPP and quarterly reporting requirements and template, further revisions on the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) procedures, planned next steps for the USDOE OSEP DMS visit, and prioritized SEA and LEA areas for improvement.
2. On August 21-25, 2023, National Coordinators, Guam CEDDERS, State Education Directors, and CELPP scholars and mentors met in Kosrae for a CELPP summer institute. 8 CELPP scholars completed the 2-year training with a capstone project to develop a leadership portfolio. As a training requirement, all scholars learn about the NDOE SPP and APR and each develop a research project that were presented at this summer institute. All presentations were documented and recommendations were considered at the SEA as well as LEA level and during the preparation of this FFY23 SPP/APR.
3. On September 11-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR and Project LIFT leadership teams convened in Chuuk for the first formal FFY23 SPP/APR meeting. At this convening, the applicable Indicator performance data were collected from each LEA and compiled into a draft FFY23 SPP/APR report. In addition, the OSEP DMS 2.0 monitoring framework and protocols were presented to these two leadership teams. Other meeting outcomes include discussions on the interim data collection process and tools, onsite verification and monitoring schedule of LEAs, continued revisions on the CIMS, overview of indicator measurements and related instructions on data collection and analysis. UOG CEDDERS consultants provided onsite Project LIFT TA to Chuuk and presented FSM LIFT status and calendaring of onsite TA to other LEAs. Participants to this meeting included UOG CEDDERS consultants (3), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (19), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (7), and Yap State (8). The 45 participants included Advisory Chairpersons/parents, Director of Education and General Education Administrators/Specialists and Classroom Teachers. On September 13, 2023 from 2-4pm, NDOE (1), Chuuk Special Education (2), Kosrae DOE (1), and UOG CEDDERS (1) met with private school principals and key staffs (6) to present and held an open discussions on parentally-placed private school children with disabilities.
4. December 12-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held second meeting in Pohnpei. Meeting outcomes were first draft of FSM FFY23 SPP/APR completed and incomplete data and slippage notes presented by LEAs, CIMS procedures further discussed in relation to General Supervision and implementation implications beginning 2023-2024, further discussions and preparations on the DMS 2.0 calendar and expectations, prioritization of improvement activities under the SPP/APR, Project LIFT, and other national and state priorities. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultant (1), NDOE staff (8), Chuuk State (9), Kosrae State (9), Pohnpei State (15), and Yap State (6). Among these participants from the states were 2 Advisory Chairpersons, 4 DOE Administrators, and 2 DOE Specialists.
5. On January 24-26, 2024, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held its final meeting in Pohnpei to confirm and verify all indicator performance data and explanation of slippage for required indicators, agreement on Indicator 17 data and implications on SSIP and local systemic improvement plan priorities and improvement activities, and finalize national and state-level focused areas for improvement. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultants (2), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (6), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (11), and Yap State (6). Among these state participants were 3 Advisory Chairpersons and 1 DOE Administrator.

## FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

### Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED Facts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

### Date:

01/10/2024

### Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 6	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	158	126	110

b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	35	43	15
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	41	46	20
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	2	0	1

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	138	126	110
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	7	12	6
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	36	73	33
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	0	0	1

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

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

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 6	78	158	56.58%	65.00%	49.37%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	89	126	68.61%	80.00%	70.63%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	36	110	41.80%	55.00%	32.73%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable**

The state-wide assessment was administered in each state on specific dates and in some states, those that were absent on those days can take the make-up test. However, the make-up test administration in each state has different issues.

In the State of Yap, the state-wide assessment make-up was offered throughout the state, including the neighboring islands that is only accessible by ship. The ship was scheduled and and make-up test administered but time on each island was not enough to test students and conduct other education activities on each island.

In the State of Kosrae, make-up is available but was not administered this reporting year due to limited resources to mobilize testing staffs to community schools, including one school that is accessible by boat only. At the time of testing and reporting of data to SEA for scoring and compilation, there was only one flight scheduled in a week out of Kosrae and it limits the time for administration of make-up test in the community schools.

In the State of Chuuk, there was an increase in the number of cases of influenza on the island and it prevented students from going to school and participation in the state-wide assessment. Procedures for make-up was based on the request of the principals, which might have impacted the availability of the make-up time. Ship and boat schedule to lagoon and outer islands was also limited.

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

The state-wide assessment was administered in each state on specific dates and in some states, those that were absent on those days can take the make-up test. However, the make-up test administration in each state has different issues.

In the State of Yap, the state-wide assessment make-up was offered throughout the state, including the neighboring islands that is only accessible by ship. The ship was scheduled and and make-up test administered but time on each island was not enough to test students and conduct other education

activities on each island.

In the State of Kosrae, make-up is available but was not administered this reporting year due to limited resources to mobilize testing staffs to community schools, including one school that is accessible by boat only. At the time of testing and reporting of data to SEA for scoring and compilation, there was only one flight scheduled in a week out of Kosrae and it limits the time for administration of make-up test in the community schools.

In the State of Chuuk, there was an increase in the number of cases of influenza on the island and it prevented students from going to school and participation in the state-wide assessment. Procedures for make-up was based on the request of the principals, which might have impacted the availability of the make-up time. Ship and boat schedule to lagoon and outer islands was also limited.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	43	138	55.95%	65.00%	31.16%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	85	126	65.69%	80.00%	67.46%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	40	110	42.62%	55.00%	36.36%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable**

The state-wide assessment was administered in each state on specific dates and in some states, those that were absent on those days can take the make-up test. However, the make-up test administration in each state has different issues.

In the State of Yap, the state-wide assessment make-up was offered throughout the state, including the neighboring islands that is only accessible by ship. The ship was scheduled and and make-up test administered but time on each island was not enough to test students and conduct other education activities on each island.

In the State of Kosrae, make-up is available but was not administered this reporting year due to limited resources to mobilize testing staffs to community schools, including one school that is accessible by boat only. At the time of testing and reporting of data to SEA for scoring and compilation, there was only one flight scheduled in a week out of Kosrae and it limits the time for administration of make-up test in the community schools.

In the State of Chuuk, there was an increase in the number of cases of influenza on the island and it prevented students from going to school and participation in the state-wide assessment. Procedures for make-up was based on the request of the principals, which might have impacted the availability of the make-up time. Ship and boat schedule to lagoon and outer islands was also limited.

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

The state-wide assessment was administered in each state on specific dates and in some states, those that were absent on those days can take the make-up test. However, the make-up test administration in each state has different issues.

In the State of Yap, the state-wide assessment make-up was offered throughout the state, including the neighboring islands that is only accessible by ship. The ship was scheduled and and make-up test administered but time on each island was not enough to test students and conduct other education activities on each island.

In the State of Kosrae, make-up is available but was not administered this reporting year due to limited resources to mobilize testing staffs to community schools, including one school that is accessible by boat only. At the time of testing and reporting of data to SEA for scoring and compilation, there was only one flight scheduled in a week out of Kosrae and it limits the time for administration of make-up test in the community schools.

In the State of Chuuk, there was an increase in the number of cases of influenza on the island and it prevented students from going to school and participation in the state-wide assessment. Procedures for make-up was based on the request of the principals, which might have impacted the availability of the make-up time. Ship and boat schedule to lagoon and outer islands was also limited.

**Regulatory Information**

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

**Public Reporting Information**

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

The FSM statewide assessment reports are made available to the public. The report can be accessed at this link: <https://www.national.doe.fm/assessment/>. These annual reports are inclusive of all students, including students with IEPs, which represents the same frequency and detail of public reporting for all students. The disaggregated data, including gender, individual scores, and data for students with IEP, are not available to the public.

FSM reports assessment results for students with disabilities through its annual APR Indicator 3, which can be accessed at this link: <https://www.national.doe.fm/education-reports/>.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**3A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3A - OSEP Response**

**3A - Required Actions**

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

## 3B - Indicator Data

### Historical Data:

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

### Targets

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates and solicits broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. The FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team is comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs, including LEA general education administrators. This leadership team serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development and this meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. In addition, the FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow (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).

NDOE facilitated public hearing in all four LEAs to present FFY2023 IDEA Part B grant application and other special education program information with parents, service providers, and the wider community. Although no policies and procedures were revised requiring public awareness and input, the public hearing opportunities allowed the parents and community members to learn about their respective Local Performance Plan (LPP) and accomplishments

and challenges. Input from the audiences were documented and considered by each LEA and the SEA in the development of the new LPP or the SPP and APR.

A summary of the public hearings held at the LEAs are as follows:

1. Chuuk State: May 10-11, 2023 on the islands of Kuchua, Tonoas and Fonomo, Udot. There were a total of 114 participants with 60 parents, 42 service providers, and 12 students.
2. Kosrae State: May 11, 2023 at Tofol, Lelu (capital of Kosrae and all four municipals were invited/participated). Total of 70 participants, with 33 parents and 37 service providers.
3. Pohnpei State: May 15-17, 2023 at Enipein, Kitti, Nett, and Saladak, U. Total of 233 participants, with 160 parents and 73 service providers.
4. Yap State: May 13 & 15, 2023 at Ablul, Tomil and Dinay, Rull. Total of 96 participants, with 38 parents, 24 service providers, and 34 students.

For the development of FSM's FFY 2022 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP (Indicator 17) report, NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

1. On July 5 & 6, 2023, NDOE Coordinators and LEA Coordinators and key staffs and Guam CEDDERS consultants convened in Kosrae during the 2023 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC). Meeting outcomes included initial discussion and planning on the FFY23 SPP/APR, agreement and finalization of the 2023-2024 LPP and quarterly reporting requirements and template, further revisions on the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) procedures, planned next steps for the USDOE OSEP DMS visit, and prioritized SEA and LEA areas for improvement.
2. On August 21-25, 2023, National Coordinators, Guam CEDDERS, State Education Directors, and CELPP scholars and mentors met in Kosrae for a CELPP summer institute. 8 CELPP scholars completed the 2-year training with a capstone project to develop a leadership portfolio. As a training requirement, all scholars learn about the NDOE SPP and APR and each develop a research project that were presented at this summer institute. All presentations were documented and recommendations were considered at the SEA as well as LEA level and during the preparation of this FFY23 SPP/APR.
3. On September 11-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR and Project LIFT leadership teams convened in Chuuk for the first formal FFY23 SPP/APR meeting. At this convening, the applicable Indicator performance data were collected from each LEA and compiled into a draft FFY23 SPP/APR report. In addition, the OSEP DMS 2.0 monitoring framework and protocols were presented to these two leadership teams. Other meeting outcomes include discussions on the interim data collection process and tools, onsite verification and monitoring schedule of LEAs, continued revisions on the CIMS, overview of indicator measurements and related instructions on data collection and analysis. UOG CEDDERS consultants provided onsite Project LIFT TA to Chuuk and presented FSM LIFT status and calendaring of onsite TA to other LEAs. Participants to this meeting included UOG CEDDERS consultants (3), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (19), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (7), and Yap State (8). The 45 participants included Advisory Chairpersons/parents, Director of Education and General Education Administrators/Specialists and Classroom Teachers. On September 13, 2023 from 2-4pm, NDOE (1), Chuuk Special Education (2), Kosrae DOE (1), and UOG CEDDERS (1) met with private school principals and key staffs (6) to present and held an open discussions on parentally-placed private school children with disabilities.
4. December 12-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held second meeting in Pohnpei. Meeting outcomes were first draft of FSM FFY23 SPP/APR completed and incomplete data and slippage notes presented by LEAs, CIMS procedures further discussed in relation to General Supervision and implementation implications beginning 2023-2024, further discussions and preparations on the DMS 2.0 calendar and expectations, prioritization of improvement activities under the SPP/APR, Project LIFT, and other national and state priorities. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultant (1), NDOE staff (8), Chuuk State (9), Kosrae State (9), Pohnpei State (15), and Yap State (6). Among these participants from the states were 2 Advisory Chairpersons, 4 DOE Administrators, and 2 DOE Specialists.
5. On January 24-26, 2024, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held its final meeting in Pohnpei to confirm and verify all indicator performance data and explanation of slippage for required indicators, agreement on Indicator 17 data and implications on SSIP and local systemic improvement plan priorities and improvement activities, and finalize national and state-level focused areas for improvement. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultants (2), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (6), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (11), and Yap State (6). Among these state participants were 3 Advisory Chairpersons and 1 DOE Administrator.

### FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

#### Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED*Facts* file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

#### Date:

01/10/2024

#### Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 6	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	76	89	35
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4	3	3
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3	0	1

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	43	85	39
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2	0	0

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 6	7	76	4.71%	10.00%	9.21%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	3	89	1.11%	10.00%	3.37%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	4	35	0.00%	10.00%	11.43%	Met target	No Slippage

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2	43	4.26%	10.00%	4.65%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	0	85	1.16%	10.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	0	39	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

Within this reporting period, the impact of COVID-19 can still be felt in some of the states. In the State of Yap, the first case was reported in August 2022 and the neighboring islands were shut off from main island of Yap and the world. Teachers and other service providers who were on the main island for the usual summer institutes remained until December 2022. During their absences, instruction was not consistent, if none at all in some atoll islands. This could have contributed to the proficiency rates. Neighboring island students who remained on the main island were given the opportunity to go to school but attendance was not consistent.

In the State of Kosrae, the school schedule was modified and implemented for most of school year 2022-2023. Instructional hours were reduced and students who were in school have limited opportunity to learn. This was done as a safety precaution as a result of the first case identified in July 2022 just before the school started. The full school schedule started in the second semester. However, unvaccinated student and staff were not allowed to enter the school campus. For special education students, home services were offered but families were still hesitant because of the potential health risk from the COVID-19 pandemic.

In the State of Chuuk, the situation is similar to that of Kosrae where school schedule was modified and return to normal school schedule came in toward the middle of the school year. This is also true for the State of Pohnpei, which first reported COVID-19 in July 2022. Schools opened at the end of September 2022, instead of beginning of August. This impacted the amount of instructional time which could have affected the students' performance.

### **Regulatory Information**

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

### **Public Reporting Information**

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

The FSM statewide assessment reports are made available to the public. The report can be accessed at this link: <https://national.doe.fm/index.php/ndoe-public/education-documents/education-reports/505-nmct-annual-report>. These annual reports are inclusive of all students, including students with IEPs, which represents the same frequency and detail of public reporting for all students. The disaggregated data, including gender, individual scores, and data for students with IEP, are not available to the public.

FSM reports assessment results for students with disabilities through its annual APR Indicator 3, which can be accessed at this link: <https://www.national.doe.fm/education-reports/>.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

### **3B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **3B - OSEP Response**

The Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) did not provide a Web link to FFY 2022 publicly-reported assessment results. Specifically, FSM provided a Web link to FFY 2021 publicly-reported assessment results for all students. FSM reports, "The disaggregated data, including gender, individual scores, and data for students with IEP, are not available to the public." FSM has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on regular assessments at the State/district or school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

### **3B - Required Actions**

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against 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 for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

### Instructions

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

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

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

## 3C - Indicator Data

### Historical Data:

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

### Targets

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

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates and solicits broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. The FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team is comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs, including LEA general education administrators. This leadership team serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development and this meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. In addition, the FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow (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).

NDOE facilitated public hearing in all four LEAs to present FFY2023 IDEA Part B grant application and other special education program information with parents, service providers, and the wider community. Although no policies and procedures were revised requiring public awareness and input, the public hearing opportunities allowed the parents and community members to learn about their respective Local Performance Plan (LPP) and accomplishments and challenges. Input from the audiences were documented and considered by each LEA and the SEA in the development of the new LPP or the SPP and APR.

A summary of the public hearings held at the LEAs are as follows:

1. Chuuk State: May 10-11, 2023 on the islands of Kuchua, Tonoas and Fonomo, Udot. There were a total of 114 participants with 60 parents, 42 service providers, and 12 students.
2. Kosrae State: May 11, 2023 at Tofol, Lelu (capital of Kosrae and all four municipals were invited/participated). Total of 70 participants, with 33 parents and 37 service providers.
3. Pohnpei State: May 15-17, 2023 at Enipein, Kittu, Nett, and Saladak, U. Total of 233 participants, with 160 parents and 73 service providers.
4. Yap State: May 13 & 15, 2023 at Ablul, Tomil and Dinay, Rull. Total of 96 participants, with 38 parents, 24 service providers, and 34 students.

For the development of FSM's FFY 2022 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP (Indicator 17) report, NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

1. On July 5 & 6, 2023, NDOE Coordinators and LEA Coordinators and key staffs and Guam CEDDERS consultants convened in Kosrae during the 2023 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC). Meeting outcomes included initial discussion and planning on the FFY23 SPP/APR, agreement and finalization of the 2023-2024 LPP and quarterly reporting requirements and template, further revisions on the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) procedures, planned next steps for the USDOE OSEP DMS visit, and prioritized SEA and LEA areas for improvement.
2. On August 21-25, 2023, National Coordinators, Guam CEDDERS, State Education Directors, and CELPP scholars and mentors met in Kosrae for a CELPP summer institute. 8 CELPP scholars completed the 2-year training with a capstone project to develop a leadership portfolio. As a training requirement, all scholars learn about the NDOE SPP and APR and each develop a research project that were presented at this summer institute. All presentations were documented and recommendations were considered at the SEA as well as LEA level and during the preparation of this FFY23 SPP/APR.
3. On September 11-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR and Project LIFT leadership teams convened in Chuuk for the first formal FFY23 SPP/APR meeting. At this convening, the applicable Indicator performance data were collected from each LEA and compiled into a draft FFY23 SPP/APR report. In addition, the OSEP DMS 2.0 monitoring framework and protocols were presented to these two leadership teams. Other meeting outcomes include discussions on the interim data collection process and tools, onsite verification and monitoring schedule of LEAs, continued revisions on the CIMS, overview of indicator measurements and related instructions on data collection and analysis. UOG CEDDERS consultants provided onsite Project LIFT TA to Chuuk and presented FSM LIFT status and calendaring of onsite TA to other LEAs. Participants to this meeting included UOG CEDDERS consultants (3), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (19), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (7), and Yap State (8). The 45 participants included Advisory Chairpersons/parents, Director of Education and General Education Administrators/Specialists and Classroom Teachers. On September 13, 2023 from 2-4pm, NDOE (1), Chuuk Special Education (2), Kosrae DOE (1), and UOG CEDDERS (1) met with private school principals and key staffs (6) to present and held an open discussions on parentally-placed private school children with disabilities.
4. December 12-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held second meeting in Pohnpei. Meeting outcomes were first draft of FSM FFY23 SPP/APR completed and incomplete data and slippage notes presented by LEAs, CIMS procedures further discussed in relation to General Supervision and implementation implications beginning 2023-2024, further discussions and preparations on the DMS 2.0 calendar and expectations, prioritization of improvement activities under the SPP/APR, Project LIFT, and other national and state priorities. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultant (1), NDOE staff (8), Chuuk State (9), Kosrae State (9), Pohnpei State (15), and Yap State (6). Among these participants from the states were 2 Advisory Chairpersons, 4 DOE Administrators, and 2 DOE Specialists.
5. On January 24-26, 2024, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held its final meeting in Pohnpei to confirm and verify all indicator performance data and explanation of slippage for required indicators, agreement on Indicator 17 data and implications on SSIP and local systemic improvement plan priorities and improvement activities, and finalize national and state-level focused areas for improvement. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultants (2), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (6), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (11), and Yap State (6). Among these state participants were 3 Advisory Chairpersons and 1 DOE Administrator.

## FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

### Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED Facts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

### Date:

01/10/2024

## Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 6	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency	2	0	1

level was assigned for the alternate assessment			
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	0	0	0

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 6	0	2	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	0	0	0.00%	10.00%		N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	0	1		10.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	N/A

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	0	0		10.00%		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	0	0	0.00%	10.00%		N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	0	1		10.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	N/A

**Regulatory Information**

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

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

The FSM statewide assessment reports are made available to the public. The report can be accessed at this link: <https://www.national.doe.fm/assessment/>. These annual reports are inclusive of all students, including students with IEPs, which represents the same frequency and detail of public reporting for all students. The disaggregated data, including gender, individual scores, and data for students with IEP, are not available to the public.

FSM reports assessment results for students with disabilities through its annual APR Indicator 3, which can be accessed at this link: <https://www.national.doe.fm/education-reports/>.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)****3C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3C - OSEP Response**

FSM did not provide a Web link to FFY 2022 publicly-reported assessment results. Specifically, FSM provided a Web link to FFY 2021 publicly-reported assessment results for all students. FSM reports, "The disaggregated data, including gender, individual scores, and data for students with IEP, are not available to the public." FSM has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the State/district or school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

**3C - Required Actions**

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

#### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### 3D - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

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

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 6	47.00	40.00	30.00	20.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	45.00	40.00	30.00	20.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	55.00	45.00	35.00	25.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	47.00	40.00	30.00	20.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	45.00	40.00	30.00	20.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	55.00	45.00	35.00	25.00

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates and solicits broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. The FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team is comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs, including LEA general education administrators. This leadership team serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development and this meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. In addition, the FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow (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).

NDOE facilitated public hearing in all four LEAs to present FFY2023 IDEA Part B grant application and other special education program information with parents, service providers, and the wider community. Although no policies and procedures were revised requiring public awareness and input, the public hearing opportunities allowed the parents and community members to learn about their respective Local Performance Plan (LPP) and accomplishments and challenges. Input from the audiences were documented and considered by each LEA and the SEA in the development of the new LPP or the SPP and APR.

A summary of the public hearings held at the LEAs are as follows:

1. Chuuk State: May 10-11, 2023 on the islands of Kuchua, Tonoas and Fonomo, Udot. There were a total of 114 participants with 60 parents, 42 service providers, and 12 students.
2. Kosrae State: May 11, 2023 at Tofol, Lelu (capital of Kosrae and all four municipals were invited/participated). Total of 70 participants, with 33 parents and 37 service providers.
3. Pohnpei State: May 15-17, 2023 at Enipein, Kitti, Nett, and Saladak, U. Total of 233 participants, with 160 parents and 73 service providers.
4. Yap State: May 13 & 15, 2023 at Ablul, Tomil and Dinay, Rull. Total of 96 participants, with 38 parents, 24 service providers, and 34 students.

For the development of FSM's FFY 2022 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP (Indicator 17) report, NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

1. On July 5 & 6, 2023, NDOE Coordinators and LEA Coordinators and key staffs and Guam CEDDERS consultants convened in Kosrae during the 2023 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC). Meeting outcomes included initial discussion and planning on the FFY23 SPP/APR, agreement and finalization of the 2023-2024 LPP and quarterly reporting requirements and template, further revisions on the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) procedures, planned next steps for the USDOE OSEP DMS visit, and prioritized SEA and LEA areas for improvement.
2. On August 21-25, 2023, National Coordinators, Guam CEDDERS, State Education Directors, and CELPP scholars and mentors met in Kosrae for a CELPP summer institute. 8 CELPP scholars completed the 2-year training with a capstone project to develop a leadership portfolio. As a training requirement, all scholars learn about the NDOE SPP and APR and each develop a research project that were presented at this summer institute. All presentations were documented and recommendations were considered at the SEA as well as LEA level and during the preparation of this FFY23 SPP/APR.
3. On September 11-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR and Project LIFT leadership teams convened in Chuuk for the first formal FFY23 SPP/APR meeting. At this convening, the applicable Indicator performance data were collected from each LEA and compiled into a draft FFY23 SPP/APR report. In addition, the OSEP DMS 2.0 monitoring framework and protocols were presented to these two leadership teams. Other meeting outcomes include discussions on the interim data collection process and tools, onsite verification and monitoring schedule of LEAs, continued revisions on the CIMS, overview of indicator measurements and related instructions on data collection and analysis. UOG CEDDERS consultants provided onsite Project LIFT TA to Chuuk and presented FSM LIFT status and calendaring of onsite TA to other LEAs. Participants to this meeting included UOG CEDDERS consultants (3), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (19), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (7), and Yap State (8). The 45 participants included Advisory Chairpersons/parents, Director of Education and General Education Administrators/Specialists and Classroom Teachers. On September 13, 2023 from 2-4pm, NDOE (1), Chuuk Special Education (2), Kosrae DOE (1), and UOG CEDDERS (1) met with private school principals and key staffs (6) to present and held an open discussions on parentally-placed private school children with disabilities.
4. December 12-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held second meeting in Pohnpei. Meeting outcomes were first draft of FSM FFY23 SPP/APR completed and incomplete data and slippage notes presented by LEAs, CIMS procedures further discussed in relation to General Supervision and implementation implications beginning 2023-2024, further discussions and preparations on the DMS 2.0 calendar and expectations, prioritization of improvement activities under the SPP/APR, Project LIFT, and other national and state priorities. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultant (1), NDOE staff (8), Chuuk State (9), Kosrae State (9), Pohnpei State (15), and Yap State (6). Among these participants from the states were 2 Advisory Chairpersons, 4 DOE Administrators, and 2 DOE Specialists.
5. On January 24-26, 2024, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held its final meeting in Pohnpei to confirm and verify all indicator performance data and explanation of slippage for required indicators, agreement on Indicator 17 data and implications on SSIP and local systemic improvement plan priorities and improvement activities, and finalize national and state-level focused areas for improvement. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultants (2), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (6), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (11), and Yap State (6). Among these state participants were 3 Advisory Chairpersons and 1 DOE Administrator.

## FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

### Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED Facts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

### Date:

01/10/2024

### Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 6	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,411	1,370	796
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	76	89	35
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	223	133	130

d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3	0	1
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4	3	3
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3	0	1

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,261	1,333	785
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	43	85	39
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	69	39	2
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2	0	0
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2	0	0

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 6	9.21%	16.02%	12.94	47.00	6.81	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	3.37%	9.71%	7.22	45.00	6.34	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	11.43%	16.46%	22.24	55.00	5.03	Met target	No Slippage

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	4.65%	5.63%	3.27	47.00	0.98	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	0.00%	2.93%	2.82	45.00	2.93	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	0.00%	0.25%	0.09	55.00	0.25	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**3D - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3D - OSEP Response**

**3D - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates and solicits broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. The FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team is comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs, including LEA general education administrators. This leadership team serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development and this meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. In addition, the FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow (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).

NDOE facilitated public hearing in all four LEAs to present FFY2023 IDEA Part B grant application and other special education program information with parents, service providers, and the wider community. Although no policies and procedures were revised requiring public awareness and input, the public hearing opportunities allowed the parents and community members to learn about their respective Local Performance Plan (LPP) and accomplishments and challenges. Input from the audiences were documented and considered by each LEA and the SEA in the development of the new LPP or the SPP and APR.

A summary of the public hearings held at the LEAs are as follows:

1. Chuuk State: May 10-11, 2023 on the islands of Kuchua, Tonoas and Fonomo, Udot. There were a total of 114 participants with 60 parents, 42 service providers, and 12 students.
2. Kosrae State: May 11, 2023 at Tofol, Lelu (capital of Kosrae and all four municipals were invited/participated). Total of 70 participants, with 33 parents and 37 service providers.
3. Pohnpei State: May 15-17, 2023 at Enipein, Kittu, Nett, and Saladak, U. Total of 233 participants, with 160 parents and 73 service providers.
4. Yap State: May 13 & 15, 2023 at Ablul, Tomil and Dinay, Rull. Total of 96 participants, with 38 parents, 24 service providers, and 34 students.

For the development of FSM's FFY 2022 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP (Indicator 17) report, NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

1. On July 5 & 6, 2023, NDOE Coordinators and LEA Coordinators and key staffs and Guam CEDDERS consultants convened in Kosrae during the 2023 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC). Meeting outcomes included initial discussion and planning on the FFY23 SPP/APR, agreement and finalization of the 2023-2024 LPP and quarterly reporting requirements and template, further revisions on the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) procedures, planned next steps for the USDOE OSEP DMS visit, and prioritized SEA and LEA areas for improvement.
2. On August 21-25, 2023, National Coordinators, Guam CEDDERS, State Education Directors, and CELPP scholars and mentors met in Kosrae for a CELPP summer institute. 8 CELPP scholars completed the 2-year training with a capstone project to develop a leadership portfolio. As a training requirement, all scholars learn about the NDOE SPP and APR and each develop a research project that were presented at this summer institute. All presentations were documented and recommendations were considered at the SEA as well as LEA level and during the preparation of this FFY23 SPP/APR.
3. On September 11-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR and Project LIFT leadership teams convened in Chuuk for the first formal FFY23 SPP/APR meeting. At this convening, the applicable indicator performance data were collected from each LEA and compiled into a draft FFY23 SPP/APR report. In addition, the OSEP DMS 2.0 monitoring framework and protocols were presented to these two leadership teams. Other meeting outcomes include discussions on the interim data collection process and tools, onsite verification and monitoring schedule of LEAs, continued revisions on the CIMS, overview of indicator measurements and related instructions on data collection and analysis. UOG CEDDERS consultants provided onsite Project LIFT TA to Chuuk and presented FSM LIFT status and calendaring of onsite TA to other LEAs. Participants to this meeting included UOG CEDDERS consultants (3), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (19), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (7), and Yap State (8). The 45 participants included Advisory Chairpersons/parents, Director of Education and General Education Administrators/Specialists and Classroom Teachers. On September 13, 2023 from 2-4pm, NDOE (1), Chuuk Special Education (2), Kosrae DOE (1), and UOG CEDDERS (1) met with private school principals and key staffs (6) to present and held an open discussions on parentally-placed private school children with disabilities.
4. December 12-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held second meeting in Pohnpei. Meeting outcomes were first draft of FSM FFY23 SPP/APR completed and incomplete data and slippage notes presented by LEAs, CIMS procedures further discussed in relation to General Supervision and implementation implications beginning 2023-2024, further discussions and preparations on the DMS 2.0 calendar and expectations, prioritization of improvement activities under the SPP/APR, Project LIFT, and other national and state priorities. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultant (1), NDOE staff (8), Chuuk State (9), Kosrae State (9), Pohnpei State (15), and Yap State (6). Among these participants from the states were 2 Advisory Chairpersons, 4 DOE Administrators, and 2 DOE Specialists.
5. On January 24-26, 2024, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held its final meeting in Pohnpei to confirm and verify all indicator performance data and explanation of slippage for required indicators, agreement on Indicator 17 data and implications on SSIP and local systemic improvement plan priorities and improvement activities, and finalize national and state-level focused areas for improvement. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultants (2), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (6), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (11), and Yap State (6). Among these state participants were 3 Advisory Chairpersons and 1 DOE Administrator.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

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

NO

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs in the State	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

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

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

Following the one-year lag data for FFY 2022, in 2021-2022, FSM did not report any long-term suspension/expulsion greater than 10 days in its 618 Discipline data report.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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.**

FSM reviewed its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, for consistency with the IDEA requirements. As a result, FSM DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4A - OSEP Response**

## 4A - Required Actions

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target			0%	0%	0%
Data					

**Targets**

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

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

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs in the State	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
				0%		N/A	N/A

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

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4B - OSEP Response**

**4B- Required Actions**

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

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

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2020	Target >=	93.00%	93.50%	93.50%	92.22%	85.00%
A	92.22%	Data	93.72%	94.20%	91.87%	92.22%	91.90%
B	2020	Target <=	1.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.12%	0.12%
B	0.12%	Data	0.35%	0.24%	0.25%	0.12%	0.43%
C	2020	Target <=	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	4.80%	4.50%
C	4.80%	Data	5.24%	5.03%	5.11%	4.80%	5.24%

### Targets

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates and solicits broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. The FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team is comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs, including LEA general education administrators. This leadership team serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development and this meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. In addition, the FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow (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).

NDOE facilitated public hearing in all four LEAs to present FFY2023 IDEA Part B grant application and other special education program information with parents, service providers, and the wider community. Although no policies and procedures were revised requiring public awareness and input, the public hearing opportunities allowed the parents and community members to learn about their respective Local Performance Plan (LPP) and accomplishments and challenges. Input from the audiences were documented and considered by each LEA and the SEA in the development of the new LPP or the SPP and APR.

A summary of the public hearings held at the LEAs are as follows:

1. Chuuk State: May 10-11, 2023 on the islands of Kuchua, Tonoas and Fonomo, Udot. There were a total of 114 participants with 60 parents, 42 service providers, and 12 students.
2. Kosrae State: May 11, 2023 at Tofol, Lelu (capital of Kosrae and all four municipals were invited/participated). Total of 70 participants, with 33 parents and 37 service providers.
3. Pohnpei State: May 15-17, 2023 at Enipein, Kittu, Nett, and Saladak, U. Total of 233 participants, with 160 parents and 73 service providers.
4. Yap State: May 13 & 15, 2023 at Ablul, Tomil and Dinay, Rull. Total of 96 participants, with 38 parents, 24 service providers, and 34 students.

For the development of FSM's FFY 2022 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP (Indicator 17) report, NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

1. On July 5 & 6, 2023, NDOE Coordinators and LEA Coordinators and key staffs and Guam CEDDERS consultants convened in Kosrae during the 2023 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC). Meeting outcomes included initial discussion and planning on the FFY23 SPP/APR, agreement and finalization of the 2023-2024 LPP and quarterly reporting requirements and template, further revisions on the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) procedures, planned next steps for the USDOE OSEP DMS visit, and prioritized SEA and LEA areas for improvement.
2. On August 21-25, 2023, National Coordinators, Guam CEDDERS, State Education Directors, and CELPP scholars and mentors met in Kosrae for a CELPP summer institute. 8 CELPP scholars completed the 2-year training with a capstone project to develop a leadership portfolio. As a training requirement, all scholars learn about the NDOE SPP and APR and each develop a research project that were presented at this summer institute. All presentations were documented and recommendations were considered at the SEA as well as LEA level and during the preparation of this FFY23 SPP/APR.
3. On September 11-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR and Project LIFT leadership teams convened in Chuuk for the first formal FFY23 SPP/APR meeting. At this convening, the applicable Indicator performance data were collected from each LEA and compiled into a draft FFY23 SPP/APR report. In addition, the OSEP DMS 2.0 monitoring framework and protocols were presented to these two leadership teams. Other meeting outcomes include discussions on the interim data collection process and tools, onsite verification and monitoring schedule of LEAs, continued revisions on the CIMS, overview of indicator measurements and related instructions on data collection and analysis. UOG CEDDERS consultants provided onsite Project LIFT TA to Chuuk and presented FSM LIFT status and calendaring of onsite TA to other LEAs. Participants to this meeting included UOG CEDDERS consultants (3), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (19), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (7), and Yap State (8). The 45 participants included Advisory Chairpersons/parents, Director of Education and General Education Administrators/Specialists and Classroom Teachers. On September 13, 2023 from 2-4pm, NDOE (1), Chuuk Special Education (2), Kosrae DOE (1), and UOG CEDDERS (1) met with private school principals and key staffs (6) to present and held an open discussions on parentally-placed private school children with disabilities.
4. December 12-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held second meeting in Pohnpei. Meeting outcomes were first draft of FSM FFY23 SPP/APR completed and incomplete data and slippage notes presented by LEAs, CIMS procedures further discussed in relation to General Supervision and implementation implications beginning 2023-2024, further discussions and preparations on the DMS 2.0 calendar and expectations, prioritization of improvement activities under the SPP/APR, Project LIFT, and other national and state priorities. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultant (1), NDOE staff (8), Chuuk State (9), Kosrae State (9), Pohnpei State (15), and Yap State (6). Among these participants from the states were 2 Advisory Chairpersons, 4 DOE Administrators, and 2 DOE Specialists.
5. On January 24-26, 2024, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held its final meeting in Pohnpei to confirm and verify all indicator performance data and explanation of slippage for required indicators, agreement on Indicator 17 data and implications on SSIP and local systemic improvement plan priorities and improvement activities, and finalize national and state-level focused areas for improvement. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultants (2), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (6), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (11), and Yap State (6). Among these state participants were 3 Advisory Chairpersons and 1 DOE Administrator.

What goes...

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	1,594
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	1,477
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	2
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	0
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	77

Source	Date	Description	Data
Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)			

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

NO

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	1,477	1,594	91.90%	85.00%	92.66%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7	1,594	0.43%	0.12%	0.44%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	79	1,594	5.24%	4.20%	4.96%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**5 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**5 - OSEP Response**

**5 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

### Historical Data (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	88.00%	90.00%	90.00%	44.00%	46.00%
A	Data	81.90%	81.94%	84.73%	44.00%	57.14%
B	Target <=	0.70%	0.60%	0.60%	0.00%	0.00%
B	Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
C	Target <=				56.00%	54.00%
C	Data				56.00%	42.86%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates and solicits broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. The FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team is comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs, including LEA general education administrators. This leadership team serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development and this meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. In addition, the FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow (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).

NDOE facilitated public hearing in all four LEAs to present FFY2023 IDEA Part B grant application and other special education program information with parents, service providers, and the wider community. Although no policies and procedures were revised requiring public awareness and input, the public hearing opportunities allowed the parents and community members to learn about their respective Local Performance Plan (LPP) and accomplishments

and challenges. Input from the audiences were documented and considered by each LEA and the SEA in the development of the new LPP or the SPP and APR.

A summary of the public hearings held at the LEAs are as follows:

1. Chuuk State: May 10-11, 2023 on the islands of Kuchua, Tonoas and Fonomo, Udot. There were a total of 114 participants with 60 parents, 42 service providers, and 12 students.
2. Kosrae State: May 11, 2023 at Tofol, Lelu (capital of Kosrae and all four municipals were invited/participated). Total of 70 participants, with 33 parents and 37 service providers.
3. Pohnpei State: May 15-17, 2023 at Enipein, Kitti, Nett, and Saladak, U. Total of 233 participants, with 160 parents and 73 service providers.
4. Yap State: May 13 & 15, 2023 at Ablul, Tomil and Dinay, Rull. Total of 96 participants, with 38 parents, 24 service providers, and 34 students.

For the development of FSM's FFY 2022 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP (Indicator 17) report, NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

1. On July 5 & 6, 2023, NDOE Coordinators and LEA Coordinators and key staffs and Guam CEDDERS consultants convened in Kosrae during the 2023 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC). Meeting outcomes included initial discussion and planning on the FFY23 SPP/APR, agreement and finalization of the 2023-2024 LPP and quarterly reporting requirements and template, further revisions on the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) procedures, planned next steps for the USDOE OSEP DMS visit, and prioritized SEA and LEA areas for improvement.
2. On August 21-25, 2023, National Coordinators, Guam CEDDERS, State Education Directors, and CELPP scholars and mentors met in Kosrae for a CELPP summer institute. 8 CELPP scholars completed the 2-year training with a capstone project to develop a leadership portfolio. As a training requirement, all scholars learn about the NDOE SPP and APR and each develop a research project that were presented at this summer institute. All presentations were documented and recommendations were considered at the SEA as well as LEA level and during the preparation of this FFY23 SPP/APR.
3. On September 11-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR and Project LIFT leadership teams convened in Chuuk for the first formal FFY23 SPP/APR meeting. At this convening, the applicable Indicator performance data were collected from each LEA and compiled into a draft FFY23 SPP/APR report. In addition, the OSEP DMS 2.0 monitoring framework and protocols were presented to these two leadership teams. Other meeting outcomes include discussions on the interim data collection process and tools, onsite verification and monitoring schedule of LEAs, continued revisions on the CIMS, overview of indicator measurements and related instructions on data collection and analysis. UOG CEDDERS consultants provided onsite Project LIFT TA to Chuuk and presented FSM LIFT status and calendaring of onsite TA to other LEAs. Participants to this meeting included UOG CEDDERS consultants (3), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (19), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (7), and Yap State (8). The 45 participants included Advisory Chairpersons/parents, Director of Education and General Education Administrators/Specialists and Classroom Teachers. On September 13, 2023 from 2-4pm, NDOE (1), Chuuk Special Education (2), Kosrae DOE (1), and UOG CEDDERS (1) met with private school principals and key staffs (6) to present and held an open discussions on parentally-placed private school children with disabilities.
4. December 12-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held second meeting in Pohnpei. Meeting outcomes were first draft of FSM FFY23 SPP/APR completed and incomplete data and slippage notes presented by LEAs, CIMS procedures further discussed in relation to General Supervision and implementation implications beginning 2023-2024, further discussions and preparations on the DMS 2.0 calendar and expectations, prioritization of improvement activities under the SPP/APR, Project LIFT, and other national and state priorities. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultant (1), NDOE staff (8), Chuuk State (9), Kosrae State (9), Pohnpei State (15), and Yap State (6). Among these participants from the states were 2 Advisory Chairpersons, 4 DOE Administrators, and 2 DOE Specialists.
5. On January 24-26, 2024, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held its final meeting in Pohnpei to confirm and verify all indicator performance data and explanation of slippage for required indicators, agreement on Indicator 17 data and implications on SSIP and local systemic improvement plan priorities and improvement activities, and finalize national and state-level focused areas for improvement. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultants (2), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (6), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (11), and Yap State (6). Among these state participants were 3 Advisory Chairpersons and 1 DOE Administrator.

**Targets**

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

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

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	48.00%	50.00%	52.00%	54.00%

Target B <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
-------------	-------	-------	-------	-------

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>	<b>2024</b>	<b>2025</b>
Target C <=	52.00%	50.00%	48.00%	46.00%

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	9	14	3	26
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	1	12	0	13
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	0	0	0	0
b2. Number of children attending separate school	0	0	0	0
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	8	2	3	13

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

NO

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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	13	26	57.14%	48.00%	50.00%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	0	26	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	13	26	42.86%	52.00%	50.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**6 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**6 - OSEP Response**

## 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 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

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

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

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

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

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

#### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2008	Target >=	85.00%	85.00%	87.00%	80.00%	80.00%
A1	79.50%	Data	100.00%	96.55%	100.00%	95.35%	100.00%

A2	2008	Target >=	71.00%	71.00%	71.00%	65.00%	67.00%
A2	65.00%	Data	79.31%	59.38%	84.85%	75.00%	85.37%
B1	2008	Target >=	78.50%	80.25%	90.00%	80.00%	80.00%
B1	80.00%	Data	96.55%	96.88%	98.33%	97.83%	100.00%
B2	2008	Target >=	65.00%	65.25%	65.25%	65.00%	67.00%
B2	65.00%	Data	58.62%	50.00%	75.76%	72.92%	70.73%
C1	2008	Target >=	87.00%	87.25%	90.00%	80.00%	80.00%
C1	87.00%	Data	92.86%	100.00%	98.41%	97.78%	100.00%
C2	2008	Target >=	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	65.00%	67.00%
C2	68.30%	Data	62.07%	59.38%	80.30%	72.92%	75.61%

### Targets

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates and solicits broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. The FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team is comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs, including LEA general education administrators. This leadership team serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development and this meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. In addition, the FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow (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).

NDOE facilitated public hearing in all four LEAs to present FFY2023 IDEA Part B grant application and other special education program information with parents, service providers, and the wider community. Although no policies and procedures were revised requiring public awareness and input, the public hearing opportunities allowed the parents and community members to learn about their respective Local Performance Plan (LPP) and accomplishments and challenges. Input from the audiences were documented and considered by each LEA and the SEA in the development of the new LPP or the SPP and APR.

A summary of the public hearings held at the LEAs are as follows:

1. Chuuk State: May 10-11, 2023 on the islands of Kuchua, Tonoas and Fonomo, Udot. There were a total of 114 participants with 60 parents, 42 service providers, and 12 students.
2. Kosrae State: May 11, 2023 at Tofol, Lelu (capital of Kosrae and all four municipals were invited/participated). Total of 70 participants, with 33 parents and 37 service providers.
3. Pohnpei State: May 15-17, 2023 at Enipein, Kittu, Nett, and Saladak, U. Total of 233 participants, with 160 parents and 73 service providers.
4. Yap State: May 13 & 15, 2023 at Ablul, Tomil and Dinay, Rull. Total of 96 participants, with 38 parents, 24 service providers, and 34 students.

For the development of FSM's FFY 2022 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP (Indicator 17) report, NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

1. On July 5 & 6, 2023, NDOE Coordinators and LEA Coordinators and key staffs and Guam CEDDERS consultants convened in Kosrae during the 2023 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC). Meeting outcomes included initial discussion and planning on the FFY23 SPP/APR, agreement and finalization of the 2023-2024 LPP and quarterly reporting requirements and template, further revisions on the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) procedures, planned next steps for the USDOE OSEP DMS visit, and prioritized SEA and LEA areas for improvement.
2. On August 21-25, 2023, National Coordinators, Guam CEDDERS, State Education Directors, and CELPP scholars and mentors met in Kosrae for a CELPP summer institute. 8 CELPP scholars completed the 2-year training with a capstone project to develop a leadership portfolio. As a training requirement, all scholars learn about the NDOE SPP and APR and each develop a research project that were presented at this summer institute. All presentations were documented and recommendations were considered at the SEA as well as LEA level and during the preparation of this FFY23 SPP/APR.
3. On September 11-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR and Project LIFT leadership teams convened in Chuuk for the first formal FFY23 SPP/APR meeting. At

this convening, the applicable Indicator performance data were collected from each LEA and compiled into a draft FFY23 SPP/APR report. In addition, the OSEP DMS 2.0 monitoring framework and protocols were presented to these two leadership teams. Other meeting outcomes include discussions on the interim data collection process and tools, onsite verification and monitoring schedule of LEAs, continued revisions on the CIMS, overview of indicator measurements and related instructions on data collection and analysis. UOG CEDDERS consultants provided onsite Project LIFT TA to Chuuk and presented FSM LIFT status and calendaring of onsite TA to other LEAs. Participants to this meeting included UOG CEDDERS consultants (3), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (19), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (7), and Yap State (8). The 45 participants included Advisory Chairpersons/parents, Director of Education and General Education Administrators/Specialists and Classroom Teachers. On September 13, 2023 from 2-4pm, NDOE (1), Chuuk Special Education (2), Kosrae DOE (1), and UOG CEDDERS (1) met with private school principals and key staffs (6) to present and held an open discussions on parentally-placed private school children with disabilities.

4. December 12-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held second meeting in Pohnpei. Meeting outcomes were first draft of FSM FFY23 SPP/APR completed and incomplete data and slippage notes presented by LEAs, CIMS procedures further discussed in relation to General Supervision and implementation implications beginning 2023-2024, further discussions and preparations on the DMS 2.0 calendar and expectations, prioritization of improvement activities under the SPP/APR, Project LIFT, and other national and state priorities. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultant (1), NDOE staff (8), Chuuk State (9), Kosrae State (9), Pohnpei State (15), and Yap State (6). Among these participants from the states were 2 Advisory Chairpersons, 4 DOE Administrators, and 2 DOE Specialists.

5. On January 24-26, 2024, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held its final meeting in Pohnpei to confirm and verify all indicator performance data and explanation of slippage for required indicators, agreement on Indicator 17 data and implications on SSIP and local systemic improvement plan priorities and improvement activities, and finalize national and state-level focused areas for improvement. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultants (2), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (6), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (11), and Yap State (6). Among these state participants were 3 Advisory Chairpersons and 1 DOE Administrator.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

31

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	10	32.26%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	19	61.29%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2	6.45%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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>	29	29	100.00%	85.00%	100.00%	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>	21	31	85.37%	69.00%	67.74%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	12	38.71%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	18	58.06%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1	3.23%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	30	30	100.00%	85.00%	100.00%	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: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	19	31	70.73%	69.00%	61.29%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	14	45.16%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	15	48.39%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2	6.45%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	29	29	100.00%	85.00%	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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	17	31	75.61%	69.00%	54.84%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	The impact of COVID-19 can still be felt in some of the states during this reporting period. From July to August of 2022, all the states had reported confirmed cases of COVID-19. Schools were opened later than usual and using a modified schedules, such as half day or rotation of grade levels on different days of the week. In Yap, access to the neighboring islands was completely closed and teachers and students on the main island could not return until December 2022. When schools later opened in all states, instructional hours were shorter or limited and students did not receive full instructional hours as mandated or required by each state department of education. The early childhood programs (ECE) in all four states are greatly affected because they run on half-day schedule and during this period, they were getting even less instructional hours. Some parents of ECE students held their kids at home for fear of the virus and the greater chance for younger kids to face complications from it. In addition, in some states, vaccination was required for school enrollment and some parents were hesitant to have their kids vaccinated. These could have contributed to the performance of our younger kids who were tested.
B2	The impact of COVID-19 can still be felt in some of the states during this reporting period. From July to August of 2022, all the states had reported confirmed cases of COVID-19. Schools were opened later than usual and using a modified schedules, such as half day or rotation of grade levels on different days of the week. In Yap, access to the neighboring islands was completely closed and teachers and students on the main island could not return until December 2022. When schools later opened in all states, instructional hours were shorter or limited and students did not receive full instructional hours as mandated or required by each state department of education. The early childhood programs (ECE) in all four states are greatly affected because they run on half-day schedule and during this period, they were getting even less instructional hours. Some parents of ECE students held their kids at home for fear of the virus and the greater chance for younger kids to face complications from it. In addition, in some states, vaccination was required for school enrollment and some parents were hesitant to have their kids vaccinated. These could have contributed to the performance of our younger kids who were tested.
C2	The impact of COVID-19 can still be felt in some of the states during this reporting period. From July to August of 2022, all the states had reported confirmed cases of COVID-19. Schools were opened later than usual and using a modified schedules, such as half day or rotation of grade levels on different days of the week. In Yap, access to the neighboring islands was completely closed and teachers and students on the main island could not return until December 2022. When schools later opened in all states, instructional hours were shorter or limited and students did not receive full instructional hours as mandated or required by each state department of education. The early childhood programs (ECE) in all four states are greatly affected because they run on half-day schedule and during this period, they were getting even less instructional hours. Some parents of ECE students held their kids at home for fear of the virus and the greater chance for younger kids to face complications from it. In addition, in some states, vaccination was required for school enrollment and some parents were hesitant to have their kids vaccinated. These could have contributed to the performance of our younger kids who were tested.

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

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

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 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 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

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

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

### 8 - Indicator Data

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

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates and solicits broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. The FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team is comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs, including LEA general education administrators. This leadership team serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development and this meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. In addition, the FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow (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).

NDOE facilitated public hearing in all four LEAs to present FFY2023 IDEA Part B grant application and other special education program information with parents, service providers, and the wider community. Although no policies and procedures were revised requiring public awareness and input, the public hearing opportunities allowed the parents and community members to learn about their respective Local Performance Plan (LPP) and accomplishments and challenges. Input from the audiences were documented and considered by each LEA and the SEA in the development of the new LPP or the SPP and APR.

A summary of the public hearings held at the LEAs are as follows:

1. Chuuk State: May 10-11, 2023 on the islands of Kuchua, Tonoas and Fonomo, Udot. There were a total of 114 participants with 60 parents, 42 service providers, and 12 students.
2. Kosrae State: May 11, 2023 at Tofol, Lelu (capital of Kosrae and all four municipals were invited/participated). Total of 70 participants, with 33 parents and 37 service providers.
3. Pohnpei State: May 15-17, 2023 at Enipein, Kitti, Nett, and Saladak, U. Total of 233 participants, with 160 parents and 73 service providers.
4. Yap State: May 13 & 15, 2023 at Ablul, Tomil and Dinay, Rull. Total of 96 participants, with 38 parents, 24 service providers, and 34 students.

For the development of FSM's FFY 2022 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP (Indicator 17) report, NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

1. On July 5 & 6, 2023, NDOE Coordinators and LEA Coordinators and key staffs and Guam CEDDERS consultants convened in Kosrae during the 2023 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC). Meeting outcomes included initial discussion and planning on the FFY23 SPP/APR, agreement and finalization of the 2023-2024 LPP and quarterly reporting requirements and template, further revisions on the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) procedures, planned next steps for the USDOE OSEP DMS visit, and prioritized SEA and LEA areas for improvement.

2. On August 21-25, 2023, National Coordinators, Guam CEDDERS, State Education Directors, and CELPP scholars and mentors met in Kosrae for a CELPP summer institute. 8 CELPP scholars completed the 2-year training with a capstone project to develop a leadership portfolio. As a training requirement, all scholars learn about the NDOE SPP and APR and each develop a research project that were presented at this summer institute. All presentations were documented and recommendations were considered at the SEA as well as LEA level and during the preparation of this FFY23 SPP/APR.

3. On September 11-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR and Project LIFT leadership teams convened in Chuuk for the first formal FFY23 SPP/APR meeting. At this convening, the applicable Indicator performance data were collected from each LEA and compiled into a draft FFY23 SPP/APR report. In addition, the OSEP DMS 2.0 monitoring framework and protocols were presented to these two leadership teams. Other meeting outcomes include discussions on the interim data collection process and tools, onsite verification and monitoring schedule of LEAs, continued revisions on the CIMS, overview of indicator measurements and related instructions on data collection and analysis. UOG CEDDERS consultants provided onsite Project LIFT TA to Chuuk and presented FSM LIFT status and calendaring of onsite TA to other LEAs. Participants to this meeting included UOG CEDDERS consultants (3), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (19), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (7), and Yap State (8). The 45 participants included Advisory Chairpersons/parents, Director of Education and General Education Administrators/Specialists and Classroom Teachers. On September 13, 2023 from 2-4pm, NDOE (1), Chuuk Special Education (2), Kosrae DOE (1), and UOG CEDDERS (1) met with private school principals and key staffs (6) to present and held an open discussions on parentally-placed private school children with disabilities.

4. December 12-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held second meeting in Pohnpei. Meeting outcomes were first draft of FSM FFY23 SPP/APR completed and incomplete data and slippage notes presented by LEAs, CIMS procedures further discussed in relation to General Supervision and implementation implications beginning 2023-2024, further discussions and preparations on the DMS 2.0 calendar and expectations, prioritization of improvement activities under the SPP/APR, Project LIFT, and other national and state priorities. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultant (1), NDOE staff (8), Chuuk State (9), Kosrae State (9), Pohnpei State (15), and Yap State (6). Among these participants from the states were 2 Advisory Chairpersons, 4 DOE Administrators, and 2 DOE Specialists.

5. On January 24-26, 2024, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held its final meeting in Pohnpei to confirm and verify all indicator performance data and explanation of slippage for required indicators, agreement on Indicator 17 data and implications on SSIP and local systemic improvement plan priorities and improvement activities, and finalize national and state-level focused areas for improvement. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultants (2), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (6), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (11), and Yap State (6). Among these state participants were 3 Advisory Chairpersons and 1 DOE Administrator.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	39.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	63.00%	64.00%	64.00%	49.00%	50.00%
Data	61.00%	55.20%	55.85%	49.33%	61.75%

#### Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	55.00%	60.00%	65.00%	67.00%

#### FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
855	1,462	61.75%	55.00%	58.48%	Met target	No Slippage

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

The FSM parent survey used in FFY 2022 was the same as in previous years. The survey was an adapted version of the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) parent survey. The same process for dissemination and collection was conducted for parents of preschool-aged children with IEPs as with the school-age group.

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

1,615

**Percentage of respondent parents**

90.53%

**Response Rate**

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	93.22%	90.53%

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

FSM's FFY 2022 return rate of 90.53% (1462/1615) is representative of the demographics of FSM's children receiving special education services, including ethnicity. FSM's child count reported ethnicity is 100% Pacific islanders based on OSEP's ethnicity categories. For geographic representation, 153 surveys, representing 9.47%, were not returned from three of the four FSM States/LEAs. The metric used to determine geographic representativeness was the +/-3% discrepancy calculation of the target population and the actual respondents. The difference between the four LEAs ranged from -2% to 1%, which indicates representativeness across the four FSM States/LEAs. Further analysis of the two FSM States with the lowest return rate at 86.71% (698/805) and 91.78% (491/535) indicated the regions/municipalities were representative within their respective communities. Of the two FSM States with the lowest return rate, one FSM State applied the +/-3% discrepancy calculation to its five regions, while the other FSM State applied the +/-3 discrepancy calculation to its eight municipalities. Both FSM States reported a discrepancy range of -2% to 2%, which is within the +/-3% range.

**Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

In the FSM, 100% of students with IEPs are categorized as Pacific islanders. The FFY 2022 return rate of 90.53% (1462/1615) is therefore representative of the ethnicity of the children receiving special education services in the FSM. The demographics of parents responding represented children receiving services. With stakeholder input, the additional demographic analyzed was geographic location, especially given the geographic distance between the four FSM States/LEAs. The return rates by LEAs included: 86.71% (698/805), 100% (134/134), 91.78% (491/535), and 98.58% (139/141). The difference in geographic location representation included a review of the two LEAs reporting the lowest return rate at 86.71% (698/805) and 91.78% (491/535). As described in the metric calculation used to determine representativeness, there was representation in geographic location in the overall return rate across the four FSM States. In addition, further analysis of the two FSM States with the lowest return rate indicated they were representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

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

YES

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

The FFY 2022 return rate of 90.53% (1462/1615) represents a 2.69% decrease in response rate from previous year's 93.22% (1553/1666) in FFY 2021. As reported by the FSM states, the decrease in response rate could have been attributed to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. After two years of restricted travel in and out of FSM, the first case of the COVID-19 virus was identified in Pohnpei in July 2022, followed by FSM opening its borders in August 2022. During school year 2022-2023, it was reported the community was still cautious with interacting with others, especially since travel into each FSM State increased that school year. Special Education staff reported families were still concerned about having individuals visit their homes or their children going to school. In addition, the increase in the influenza virus in Spring 2023 concerned families that it might be the COVID-19 virus.

FSM will continue to conduct the survey using paper copies and in-person interviews, using translated versions of the survey. In FFY 2022, Yap State utilized their Interagency Advisory Council and parent members to conduct the surveys via in-person interviews. In Pohnpei State, case managers and consulting resource teachers conducted the surveys via in-person interviews. Pohnpei State also collected completed surveys sent out to outer island communities and to parents who preferred to complete the survey and turn it in to their community school. In addition, Pohnpei State disseminated and collected parent surveys during the May 2023 public hearing on special education.

In Kosrae State, the Interagency Advisory Council chairperson and select parent members from each municipality conducted the survey via in-person interviews. Special education staff supported the interviews that were not in their assigned schools/municipalities. In Chuuk State, office staff went on the ship to conduct the surveys in the outer islands. In the lagoon islands, the case managers and the special education teachers conducted the surveys in-person and also collected the completed surveys from schools.

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

The FFY 2022 return rate of 90.53% (1462/1615) represents a significantly high response rate. Further, FSM did not identify any nonresponse bias in its response rate. The analysis of the potential nonresponse bias included a review of certain characteristics of the census population surveyed: ethnicity and location of the respondents compared to the nonrespondents in the FSM. Annually, FSM surveys all parents of children with an IEP to respond to the Indicator 8 measure. FSM States make available a translated version of the survey in the vernacular and/or language interpreters through the use of parents in their respective State Advisory Panel.

For ethnicity, FSM reports 100% of their children with an IEP as Pacific Islanders based on OSEP's ethnicity categories. In reviewing location, three of the four states/LEAs did not report a 100% return rate. A review of the LEA survey dissemination processes indicated a similar process of follow-up communication with families across the municipalities/areas of the LEAs. Also, this location trait of the target population did not show any significant difference between the returned and unreturned surveys with regards to the location or municipality on the main island versus the remote neighboring/outer islands.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**8 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**8 - OSEP Response**

**8 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. 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 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

#### Instructions

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

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

### 9 - Indicator Data

#### Not Applicable

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

YES

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.**

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

### 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 9 - OSEP Response

### 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 section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in 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). In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

#### Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

### 10 - Indicator Data

#### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

#### Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

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

### 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 10 - OSEP Response

### 10 - Required Actions



## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	95.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	97.59%	97.93%	100.00%	100.00%

### Targets

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

### FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
221	221	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

0

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

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The evaluation data were compiled through a review of each FSM State/LEA excel data spreadsheet of all children for whom a parental consent to evaluate was received for the report year July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023. The evaluation data were collected through each FSM State/LEA inputting the completion dates into their excel system and submitting the validated excel spreadsheet to the FSM NDOE based on the completed FSM IDEA procedural forms. FSM NDOE verifies the excel spreadsheet for accurate data based on the required timeline.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**11 - OSEP Response**

**11 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

YES

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.**

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

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - Required Actions

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	88.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

### Targets

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

### FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
243	243	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The secondary transition data were compiled through a review of each FSM State/LEA excel data spreadsheet of all youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain the required secondary transition components for the report year July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023. The secondary transition data were collected through each FSM State/LEA inputting the data into their excel system and submitting the validated excel spreadsheet to the FSM NDOE based on the completed FSM IDEA procedural form. FSM NDOE verifies the excel spreadsheet for accurate data based on the required secondary transition components.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**13 - OSEP Response**

**13 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# 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 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

#### I. Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

### III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

Include the State’s 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 must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2009	Target >=	14.00%	14.00%	15.00%	26.00%	26.00%
A	13.00%	Data	23.19%	20.91%	10.78%	26.23%	25.64%
B	2009	Target >=	55.00%	60.00%	50.00%	40.00%	40.00%
B	26.00%	Data	46.38%	38.18%	28.43%	40.98%	46.15%
C	2009	Target >=	68.00%	70.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
C	34.00%	Data	100.00%	97.27%	100.00%	100.00%	97.44%

### FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	27.00%	27.00%	28.00%	29.00%
Target B >=	41.00%	41.00%	42.00%	43.00%
Target C >=	90.00%	90.00%	95.00%	95.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates and solicits broad stakeholder input for FSM’s IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. The FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team is comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs, including LEA general education administrators. This leadership team serves as FSM’s broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development and this meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. In addition, the FSM RTI initiative or FSM’s Project Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow (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).

NDOE facilitated public hearing in all four LEAs to present FFY2023 IDEA Part B grant application and other special education program information with parents, service providers, and the wider community. Although no policies and procedures were revised requiring public awareness and input, the public

hearing opportunities allowed the parents and community members to learn about their respective Local Performance Plan (LPP) and accomplishments and challenges. Input from the audiences were documented and considered by each LEA and the SEA in the development of the new LPP or the SPP and APR.

A summary of the public hearings held at the LEAs are as follows:

1. Chuuk State: May 10-11, 2023 on the islands of Kuchua, Tonoas and Fonomo, Udot. There were a total of 114 participants with 60 parents, 42 service providers, and 12 students.
2. Kosrae State: May 11, 2023 at Tofol, Lelu (capital of Kosrae and all four municipals were invited/participated). Total of 70 participants, with 33 parents and 37 service providers.
3. Pohnpei State: May 15-17, 2023 at Enipein, Kitt, Nett, and Saladak, U. Total of 233 participants, with 160 parents and 73 service providers.
4. Yap State: May 13 & 15, 2023 at Ablul, Tomil and Dinay, Rull. Total of 96 participants, with 38 parents, 24 service providers, and 34 students.

For the development of FSM's FFY 2022 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP (Indicator 17) report, NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

1. On July 5 & 6, 2023, NDOE Coordinators and LEA Coordinators and key staffs and Guam CEDDERS consultants convened in Kosrae during the 2023 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC). Meeting outcomes included initial discussion and planning on the FFY23 SPP/APR, agreement and finalization of the 2023-2024 LPP and quarterly reporting requirements and template, further revisions on the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) procedures, planned next steps for the USDOE OSEP DMS visit, and prioritized SEA and LEA areas for improvement.
2. On August 21-25, 2023, National Coordinators, Guam CEDDERS, State Education Directors, and CELPP scholars and mentors met in Kosrae for a CELPP summer institute. 8 CELPP scholars completed the 2-year training with a capstone project to develop a leadership portfolio. As a training requirement, all scholars learn about the NDOE SPP and APR and each develop a research project that were presented at this summer institute. All presentations were documented and recommendations were considered at the SEA as well as LEA level and during the preparation of this FFY23 SPP/APR.
3. On September 11-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR and Project LIFT leadership teams convened in Chuuk for the first formal FFY23 SPP/APR meeting. At this convening, the applicable Indicator performance data were collected from each LEA and compiled into a draft FFY23 SPP/APR report. In addition, the OSEP DMS 2.0 monitoring framework and protocols were presented to these two leadership teams. Other meeting outcomes include discussions on the interim data collection process and tools, onsite verification and monitoring schedule of LEAs, continued revisions on the CIMS, overview of indicator measurements and related instructions on data collection and analysis. UOG CEDDERS consultants provided onsite Project LIFT TA to Chuuk and presented FSM LIFT status and calendaring of onsite TA to other LEAs. Participants to this meeting included UOG CEDDERS consultants (3), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (19), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (7), and Yap State (8). The 45 participants included Advisory Chairpersons/parents, Director of Education and General Education Administrators/Specialists and Classroom Teachers. On September 13, 2023 from 2-4pm, NDOE (1), Chuuk Special Education (2), Kosrae DOE (1), and UOG CEDDERS (1) met with private school principals and key staffs (6) to present and held an open discussions on parentally-placed private school children with disabilities.
4. December 12-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held second meeting in Pohnpei. Meeting outcomes were first draft of FSM FFY23 SPP/APR completed and incomplete data and slippage notes presented by LEAs. CIMS procedures further discussed in relation to General Supervision and implementation implications beginning 2023-2024, further discussions and preparations on the DMS 2.0 calendar and expectations, prioritization of improvement activities under the SPP/APR, Project LIFT, and other national and state priorities. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultant (1), NDOE staff (8), Chuuk State (9), Kosrae State (9), Pohnpei State (15), and Yap State (6). Among these participants from the states were 2 Advisory Chairpersons, 4 DOE Administrators, and 2 DOE Specialists.
5. On January 24-26, 2024, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held its final meeting in Pohnpei to confirm and verify all indicator performance data and explanation of slippage for required indicators, agreement on Indicator 17 data and implications on SSIP and local systemic improvement plan priorities and improvement activities, and finalize national and state-level focused areas for improvement. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultants (2), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (6), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (11), and Yap State (6). Among these state participants were 3 Advisory Chairpersons and 1 DOE Administrator.

#### FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	112
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	112
Response Rate	100.00%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	30
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	28
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)	2
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).	51

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	30	112	25.64%	27.00%	26.79%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	58	112	46.15%	41.00%	51.79%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	111	112	97.44%	90.00%	99.11%	Met target	No Slippage

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

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

**Response Rate**

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	100.00%	100.00%

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

Not applicable. In FFY 2022, FSM reported 100% (112/112) return rate.

**Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

In FFY 2022, FSM reported 100% (112/112) return rate, which represents the demographics of youth who no longer were in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school for the reporting period. The FFY 2022 leavers for Indicator 14 were the exiters reported in the IDEA 618 exit data for 2021-2022. There was a total of 120 reported exiters for 2021-2022: 53 graduates with a high school diploma, 15 reached maximum age, and 52 drop-outs. Of the 120 exiters, seven returned to school the following year and one died shortly after leaving school. Therefore, the total leavers reported for FFY 2022 Indicator 14 was 112.

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

YES

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

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

In FFY 2022, FSM reported 100% (112/112) return rate, which represented the same percentage as in previous year's return rate of 100% (78/78) for FFY 2021. Following the PSO survey guidance for collecting data, FSM continues to be successful in contacting its leavers and/or their family members to gather required information.

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

In FFY 2022, FSM reported 100% (112/112) return rate. Following the PSO survey guidance for collecting data, FSM continues to be successful in contacting its leavers and/or their family members to gather required information.

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

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**14 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**14 - OSEP Response**

**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 and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

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

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

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

### 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

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

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates and solicits broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. The FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team is comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs, including LEA general education administrators. This leadership team serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development and this meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. In addition, the FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow (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).

NDOE facilitated public hearing in all four LEAs to present FFY2023 IDEA Part B grant application and other special education program information with parents, service providers, and the wider community. Although no policies and procedures were revised requiring public awareness and input, the public hearing opportunities allowed the parents and community members to learn about their respective Local Performance Plan (LPP) and accomplishments and challenges. Input from the audiences were documented and considered by each LEA and the SEA in the development of the new LPP or the SPP and APR.

A summary of the public hearings held at the LEAs are as follows:

1. Chuuk State: May 10-11, 2023 on the islands of Kuchua, Tonoas and Fonomo, Udot. There were a total of 114 participants with 60 parents, 42 service providers, and 12 students.
2. Kosrae State: May 11, 2023 at Tofol, Lelu (capital of Kosrae and all four municipals were invited/participated). Total of 70 participants, with 33 parents and 37 service providers.
3. Pohnpei State: May 15-17, 2023 at Enipein, Kitti, Nett, and Saladak, U. Total of 233 participants, with 160 parents and 73 service providers.
4. Yap State: May 13 & 15, 2023 at Ablul, Tomil and Dinay, Rull. Total of 96 participants, with 38 parents, 24 service providers, and 34 students.

For the development of FSM's FFY 2022 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP (Indicator 17) report, NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

1. On July 5 & 6, 2023, NDOE Coordinators and LEA Coordinators and key staffs and Guam CEDDERS consultants convened in Kosrae during the 2023 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC). Meeting outcomes included initial discussion and planning on the FFY23 SPP/APR, agreement and finalization of the 2023-2024 LPP and quarterly reporting requirements and template, further revisions on the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) procedures, planned next steps for the USDOE OSEP DMS visit, and prioritized SEA and LEA areas for improvement.

2. On August 21-25, 2023, National Coordinators, Guam CEDDERS, State Education Directors, and CELPP scholars and mentors met in Kosrae for a CELPP summer institute. 8 CELPP scholars completed the 2-year training with a capstone project to develop a leadership portfolio. As a training requirement, all scholars learn about the NDOE SPP and APR and each develop a research project that were presented at this summer institute. All presentations were documented and recommendations were considered at the SEA as well as LEA level and during the preparation of this FFY23 SPP/APR.

3. On September 11-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR and Project LIFT leadership teams convened in Chuuk for the first formal FFY23 SPP/APR meeting. At this convening, the applicable Indicator performance data were collected from each LEA and compiled into a draft FFY23 SPP/APR report. In addition, the OSEP DMS 2.0 monitoring framework and protocols were presented to these two leadership teams. Other meeting outcomes include discussions on the interim data collection process and tools, onsite verification and monitoring schedule of LEAs, continued revisions on the CIMS, overview of indicator measurements and related instructions on data collection and analysis. UOG CEDDERS consultants provided onsite Project LIFT TA to Chuuk and presented FSM LIFT status and calendaring of onsite TA to other LEAs. Participants to this meeting included UOG CEDDERS consultants (3), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (19), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (7), and Yap State (8). The 45 participants included Advisory Chairpersons/parents, Director of Education and General Education Administrators/Specialists and Classroom Teachers. On September 13, 2023 from 2-4pm, NDOE (1), Chuuk Special Education (2), Kosrae DOE (1), and UOG CEDDERS (1) met with private school principals and key staffs (6) to present and held an open discussions on parentally-placed private school children with disabilities.

4. December 12-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held second meeting in Pohnpei. Meeting outcomes were first draft of FSM FFY23 SPP/APR completed and incomplete data and slippage notes presented by LEAs, CIMS procedures further discussed in relation to General Supervision and implementation implications beginning 2023-2024, further discussions and preparations on the DMS 2.0 calendar and expectations, prioritization of improvement activities under the SPP/APR, Project LIFT, and other national and state priorities. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultant (1), NDOE staff (8), Chuuk State (9), Kosrae State (9), Pohnpei State (15), and Yap State (6). Among these participants from the states were 2 Advisory Chairpersons, 4 DOE Administrators, and 2 DOE Specialists.

5. On January 24-26, 2024, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held its final meeting in Pohnpei to confirm and verify all indicator performance data and explanation of slippage for required indicators, agreement on Indicator 17 data and implications on SSIP and local systemic improvement plan priorities and improvement activities, and finalize national and state-level focused areas for improvement. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultants (2), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (6), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (11), and Yap State (6). Among these state participants were 3 Advisory Chairpersons and 1 DOE Administrator.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=				.00%	0.00%
Data					

#### Targets

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

#### FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0		0.00%		N/A	N/A

#### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Per OSEP's instruction, FSM is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

#### 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

#### 15 - OSEP Response

FSM reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2022. FSM is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

## 15 - Required Actions

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

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

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

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

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

## 16 - Indicator Data

### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

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

NO

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates and solicits broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. The FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team is comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs, including LEA general education administrators. This leadership team serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development and this meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. In addition, the FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow (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).

NDOE facilitated public hearing in all four LEAs to present FFY2023 IDEA Part B grant application and other special education program information with parents, service providers, and the wider community. Although no policies and procedures were revised requiring public awareness and input, the public hearing opportunities allowed the parents and community members to learn about their respective Local Performance Plan (LPP) and accomplishments and challenges. Input from the audiences were documented and considered by each LEA and the SEA in the development of the new LPP or the SPP and APR.

A summary of the public hearings held at the LEAs are as follows:

1. Chuuk State: May 10-11, 2023 on the islands of Kuchua, Tonoas and Fonomo, Udot. There were a total of 114 participants with 60 parents, 42 service providers, and 12 students.
2. Kosrae State: May 11, 2023 at Tofol, Lelu (capital of Kosrae and all four municipals were invited/participated). Total of 70 participants, with 33 parents and 37 service providers.
3. Pohnpei State: May 15-17, 2023 at Enipein, Kitti, Nett, and Saladak, U. Total of 233 participants, with 160 parents and 73 service providers.
4. Yap State: May 13 & 15, 2023 at Ablul, Tomil and Dinay, Rull. Total of 96 participants, with 38 parents, 24 service providers, and 34 students.

For the development of FSM's FFY 2022 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP (Indicator 17) report, NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

1. On July 5 & 6, 2023, NDOE Coordinators and LEA Coordinators and key staffs and Guam CEDDERS consultants convened in Kosrae during the 2023 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC). Meeting outcomes included initial discussion and planning on the FFY23 SPP/APR, agreement and finalization of the 2023-2024 LPP and quarterly reporting requirements and template, further revisions on the Continuous Improvement

Monitoring System (CIMS) procedures, planned next steps for the USDOE OSEP DMS visit, and prioritized SEA and LEA areas for improvement.

2. On August 21-25, 2023, National Coordinators, Guam CEDDERS, State Education Directors, and CELPP scholars and mentors met in Kosrae for a CELPP summer institute. 8 CELPP scholars completed the 2-year training with a capstone project to develop a leadership portfolio. As a training requirement, all scholars learn about the NDOE SPP and APR and each develop a research project that were presented at this summer institute. All presentations were documented and recommendations were considered at the SEA as well as LEA level and during the preparation of this FFY23 SPP/APR.

3. On September 11-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR and Project LIFT leadership teams convened in Chuuk for the first formal FFY23 SPP/APR meeting. At this convening, the applicable Indicator performance data were collected from each LEA and compiled into a draft FFY23 SPP/APR report. In addition, the OSEP DMS 2.0 monitoring framework and protocols were presented to these two leadership teams. Other meeting outcomes include discussions on the interim data collection process and tools, onsite verification and monitoring schedule of LEAs, continued revisions on the CIMS, overview of indicator measurements and related instructions on data collection and analysis. UOG CEDDERS consultants provided onsite Project LIFT TA to Chuuk and presented FSM LIFT status and calendaring of onsite TA to other LEAs. Participants to this meeting included UOG CEDDERS consultants (3), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (19), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (7), and Yap State (8). The 45 participants included Advisory Chairpersons/parents, Director of Education and General Education Administrators/Specialists and Classroom Teachers. On September 13, 2023 from 2-4pm, NDOE (1), Chuuk Special Education (2), Kosrae DOE (1), and UOG CEDDERS (1) met with private school principals and key staffs (6) to present and held an open discussions on parentally-placed private school children with disabilities.

4. December 12-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held second meeting in Pohnpei. Meeting outcomes were first draft of FSM FFY23 SPP/APR completed and incomplete data and slippage notes presented by LEAs, CIMS procedures further discussed in relation to General Supervision and implementation implications beginning 2023-2024, further discussions and preparations on the DMS 2.0 calendar and expectations, prioritization of improvement activities under the SPP/APR, Project LIFT, and other national and state priorities. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultant (1), NDOE staff (8), Chuuk State (9), Kosrae State (9), Pohnpei State (15), and Yap State (6). Among these participants from the states were 2 Advisory Chairpersons, 4 DOE Administrators, and 2 DOE Specialists.

5. On January 24-26, 2024, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held its final meeting in Pohnpei to confirm and verify all indicator performance data and explanation of slippage for required indicators, agreement on Indicator 17 data and implications on SSIP and local systemic improvement plan priorities and improvement activities, and finalize national and state-level focused areas for improvement. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultants (2), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (6), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (11), and Yap State (6). Among these state participants were 3 Advisory Chairpersons and 1 DOE Administrator.

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=				.00%	0.00%
Data					

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0		0.00%		N/A	N/A

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Per OSEP's instruction, FSM is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

**16 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**16 - OSEP Response**

FSM reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2022. FSM is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

**16 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

#### Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

##### Phase I: Analysis:

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

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

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

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

#### Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

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

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

##### Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

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

###### A. Data Analysis

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

###### B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

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

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

### C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

#### Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

### Section A: Data Analysis

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

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

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

NO

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

YES

#### Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

The subset of the population is ECE through grade 5 in four model schools: one model school in each FSM State.

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

NO

#### Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

<https://www.national.doe.fm/education-reports/>. FSM utilizes the logic model as its theory of action (if, then).

The logic model which was utilized in the last FSM SSIP cycle focused on building capacity and infrastructure at the national, state and school level. Based on results of individual state snapshots conducted during the evaluation of the last FSM SSIP cycle, evaluators engaged with each State RTI team and stakeholders to develop state-specific logic models that reflect the current context and implementation of the SSIP improvement activities within each State. The national logic model is a composite of the four State logic models. Each State will utilize its logic model to guide implementation as evaluators develop state-specific snapshots of accomplishments, documenting, exploring, and capturing appropriate context for each State. The national logic model will be used to guide the overall evaluation of the FSM SSIP.

FSM's logic model articulates three key strategy focus areas: (1) RTI framework, including building teacher and state capacity, conducting ongoing assessment and examination of student learning results; (2) family partnerships; and (3) community collaboration. Specific actions are identified to address the three key strategies. From the actions, the logic model conveys the processes which will occur. Short term outcomes focus on building teacher knowledge of various components of the reading program as well as attending to how coaches support reading instruction. Mid-term outcomes address the application of knowledge and fidelity to implementation. Both the short and mid-term outcomes also articulate improved awareness, understanding, and implementation of literacy efforts for both families and communities. Long-term outcomes contribute to the achievement of the SiMR. The FSM SSIP Evaluation Plan incorporates formative and summative evaluation questions as well as timelines for reporting results, in addition to incorporating a variety of qualitative and quantitative data collection methods designed to provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. Grounded by the evaluation questions, the FSM SSIP evaluation plan includes performance measures keyed to strategies and outcomes of the Logic Model. FSM's performance measures (PMs) include:

PM1: % of teachers of students ECE-Grade 5 who implement core reading instruction, using evidence-based practices with fidelity

PM2: % of instructional coaches who support teachers in the use of evidence-based literacy practices

PM3: % of teachers of students ECE-Grade 5 who use ELMO data to implement screening, progress monitoring, and instructional decision making with fidelity

PM4: % of students ECE-Grade 5 demonstrate gains in early literacy skills

PM5: % of teachers and administrators who report an increase family engagement in early literacy development

PM6: % of parents/families who report an increase in family engagement in early literacy development

PM7: % of states that indicate effective implementation of the LSIP

PM8: % of RTI teams, NDOE, and school and teacher staff who report support for implementation of early literacy reading instruction and interventions

Throughout the narrative describing FSM's SSIP implementation and evaluation, the performance measures are keyed to specific data collection results included in this report. Sigma evaluators conducted a variety of evaluation activities virtually, including regular evaluation meetings with each SDOE as well as data collection activities. Onsite evaluation data collection activities were conducted by SSIP evaluators in Kosrae during this reporting period. The evaluators are working closely with the Technical Assistance consultants from University of Guam CEDDERS to support data collection for the evaluation, as they are onsite in FSM more frequently than the evaluation team is able to be onsite. As a result, evaluation data was collected during TA visits to Chuuk and Yap. After extensive needs assessment activities, TA consultants have developed a plan for supporting RTI implementation and ongoing coaching. Due to this review and adjustment of TA services, observations were not conducted during the reporting period. The TA consultants did conduct on-site visits to the States and collected evaluation data in the course of those visits.

### Progress toward the SiMR

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

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

YES

**Historical Data**

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

**Targets**

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	30.00%	31.00%	32.00%	33.00%
Target B	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	11.00%	13.00%	15.00%	17.00%

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

Part	Students at the model schools who scored at Benchmark	Students who were tested and received a valid score at the model schools	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	98	296	39.70%	30.00%	33.11%	Met target	No Slippage
B	1	15	10.53%	11.00%	6.67%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for B slippage, if applicable**

Three of four states reported FFY2022 End-of-Year (EOY) performance data on students at Benchmark. For the state that did not report data, coaching was not consistently provided to the school due to the absence of the coach who was on maternity leave. Because our number of students with IEPs in the model schools is small, the impact of one child's results significantly affects our performance data.

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.**

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

The FFY 2022 data, as in previous year's submission, are retrieved from the FSM Early Literacy Monitoring (ELMo) web-based student data system.

The FFY 2022 data displayed as A and B are:

A = All students at the model schools = 33.11% (98/296) representing 98 students scoring at benchmark (numerator) out of 296 students who took the test and received a valid score (denominator).

B = Students with IEPs at the model schools = 6.67% (1/15) representing 1 student with an IEP scoring at benchmark (numerator) out of 15 students with an IEP who took the test and received a valid score (denominator).

The FFY 2022 data represented the End-of-Year (EOY) assessment in three of four model schools of Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap.

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

For this reporting year, student performance data are retrieved from both FSM's Early Literacy Monitoring (ELMo) web-based student data system and excel spreadsheets. On the ELMo collection process, each model/scale-up school is able to input each assessment result directly into the system and view student performance data instantly at the individual, classroom, and state levels. ELMo requires access permissions for ensuring confidentiality. NDOE is responsible for providing each State-Level/LEA Project LIFT Team member with their level of access, depending upon their role for inputting and/or viewing student data. At the National or SEA level, NDOE is able to view all student data to monitor assessment participation and performance data. On the excel spreadsheet collection process, the same spreadsheet that states use to fill out ELMo are submitted to NDOE for verification of student enrollment and performance data.

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

NO

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

NO

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

NO

## **Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

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

<https://www.national.doe.fm/education-reports/>

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

NO

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

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

Strategy 2 of FSM's SSIP logic model addresses the importance of enhancing family partnerships to support improved early literacy outcomes for students in FSM. FSM National Department of Education (NDOE) and its State Departments of Education (SDOEs) are leveraging the work happening in its awarded OSEP personnel preparation and leadership grants, focusing on implementing activities designed to improve family engagement in model and scale up schools. School and State personnel have access to parent friendly materials designed by program scholars, strategies for school level family engagement activities, and other resources created by scholars in these two FSM grant programs. In addition, model and scale up schools continue to build upon the family engagement strategies implemented during the first cycle of the SSIP.

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

Professional Development (PD) and Technical Assistance (TA)

Training for model and scale up schools continues to be a priority for National and State RTI teams. During this reporting period, PD and TA was provided by Project LIFT coaches to teachers and other support personnel in all project schools, including scale up schools.

Each State develops a Local Systemic Improvement Plan (LSIP) to outline activities aligned to their logic model. Most of the states have set a schedule of providing at least three (3) trainings per school year. State RTI teams worked with external evaluators to co-create an end-of-training instrument to disseminate after each training session. This instrument captures both satisfaction and areas of need for further training.

University of Guam (UoG) CEDDERS provides technical assistance and professional development to support implementation of Project LIFT to coaches, model and scale up schools and state RTI teams. As part of their work, the TA/PD providers conduct regular state TA visits and quarterly all state TA visits, working with both Project Lift schools and coaches. More detail regarding the TA/ PD activities and evaluation results is provided later in this report.

Sigma Associates Incorporated, external evaluators for FSM's SSIP and developers of FSM's ELMo system, provided several TA activities to SDOEs. Sigma has established a structure for virtual evaluation TA activities designed to continue to build capacity for each RTI team to conduct internal evaluation of their system and initiatives in order to address continuous improvement efforts. In addition to its evaluation technical assistance and capacity building to states, Sigma provided on-going TA and support to state RTI teams as they utilize the features of ELMo to collect and analyze student level early literacy data.

In addition to the PD and TA described above, FSM NDOE continues to leverage its two OSEP funded grants to support SSIP activities: one is focused on building special education leadership, and the other is focused on teacher retention. The awards of these two grants have provided FSM with a unique opportunity to develop a comprehensive PD and training system that will serve as the catalyst for providing ongoing support to all schools and states across FSM. Specific components of the grants are being leveraged to support SSIP schools. In particular, PD modules have been developed from both grants on topics including Special Education regulations and policy, understanding of the core components of effective family engagement, using implementation science to guide systems change, and reflective leadership practices. NDOE also engaged in webinars provided by OSEP TA centers as possible with time zone differences.

Data Systems

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

Accountability and Monitoring

As part of its efforts to reflect the current scope of FSM SSIP implementation, NDOE and its SDOEs worked with the external evaluators to create an LSIP template that is aligned with the SSIP logic model and each State's specific logic model, as well as the evaluation plan, as reported in previous SSIP reports.

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

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

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

An important aspect of conducting an evaluation in FSM is the consideration of culture and its context within the implementation of the SSIP. Culturally

responsive evaluators honor the cultural context in which an evaluation takes place by bringing needed, shared life experiences and understandings to the evaluation tasks (Frierson, Hood, Stafford, & Hughes, 2002). Evaluators from Sigma Associates Incorporated (SAI) strive to ensure that cultural considerations are always in the forefront of the development of data collection instruments, analysis procedures, and reporting.

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

#### Implementing RTI Effectively

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

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

In this reporting period, coaches focused on supporting a targeted group of teachers in their schools to learn how to administer the screenings at beginning, middle, and end of the year. By building these skills for the teachers, coaches will have more time to provide instructional coaching in the classrooms and through group PD sessions.

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

#### Family Partnerships

Activities continue at the school level to address the short-term outcome to increase families' awareness of early literacy efforts. Student results are shared at PTA meetings, and literacy nights have become a part of school level schedules.

#### Community Collaboration

The governance structure of the State RTI teams facilitates engagement of representatives from parent councils, general education, and other agencies at the state level and guides efforts to improve English reading proficiency. Tracking process outcomes related to RTI team membership, number and focus of the meetings convened, and dissemination of SiMR results, will ensure accountability and address the short-term outcome that stakeholders are aware of the literacy efforts. The State RTI team structure has potential for sustaining efforts across FSM in that the regular cross-State sharing of information and successes at regular points in time builds a national community focused on the mid-term outcome of collaborating to support early literacy efforts. Data are provided later in this report regarding collaboration to support SSIP implementation.

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

NO

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

No new infrastructure improvement strategies implemented during this reporting period.

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

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

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

#### **Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

##### 1. Response to Intervention

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

##### 2. Curriculum-Based Measures-CBMs (DIBELS)

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

##### 3. Early Literacy Reading Programs

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

##### 4. Literacy Coaching

FSM has a structured instructional coaching system integrated into their early literacy PD/TA. Each State has identified a lead coach who receives ongoing PD to assist them in providing teachers at the schools' support in English language reading instruction. Based on the literature on effective coaching, the coaches provide regular monthly PD to teachers, follow-up coaching, observations, and feedback. Coaches are embedded at the SSIP schools and all work closely with principals and teachers to share responsibility for effective implementation of reading instruction. In this reporting period, UOG has worked closely with coaches on establishing clear coaching practices and building the skills necessary to support those practices. Namely: alliance building, modeling, observation, and feedback. Requisite forms and resources (e.g., coaching logs) are structured to capture data on each of these skills and practices.

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

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

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

A key component to addressing fidelity of implementation to the RTI model is addressed in the first strategy of the logic model. This strategy concentrates on the need for continuous support and monitoring of implementation on multiple levels, including at the coach, teacher, and student level. Specific activities undertaken during this reporting period include: 1) TA provided to coaches on establishing effective practices, as well as a focus on supporting teachers in screening progress monitoring, 2) State RTI teams conducting RTI meetings, and 3) NDOE review of and feedback on State LSIPs.

Teacher Observations: As described earlier in this report, due to the revised TA planning and implementation by the University of Guam consultants, no formal observations were conducted in this reporting period. As the coaches receive more support and resources to help them in effectively supporting teachers, the observations will resume, and data will be collected and reported in the next APR submission.

Coaching Data: The Coaches' survey provides data to answer the performance measure "To what extent do instructional coaches support teachers in the use of evidence-based literacy practices?" The external evaluators distributed a survey to the RTI coaches in all states. Data from teachers were not gathered for this cycle. The Coaches' survey was completed by 12 coaches. The survey included items on the training and support that coaches received, opportunities to network with other coaches, and confidence in supporting their school as a coach. The survey also included items on their coaching skills and practices. Specifically, the questions focused on their coaching practices to support teachers in reading instruction. 100% of the coaches strongly agreed or agreed that the training for coaching they received was effective, helped them develop new coaching skills to help teachers engage in equitable reading instruction, and the training helped them strengthen their coaching skills. 92% of the coaches strongly agreed or agreed that the training provided them with effective strategies around equitable reading instruction and that they felt supported as a coach. 75% of the coaches strongly agreed or agreed that they were provided opportunities to connect with other coaches, that they felt confident in supporting their school as a coach and that their coaching will help their school provide equitable reading instruction for all students.

With respect to coaching practices, 92% of the coaches strongly agreed or agreed that they believe there are clear goals for reading coaches, that they support teachers in identifying and/or creating resources to engage in equitable reading instruction for their students, and that they are able to listen empathetically and actively to the teachers they coach. 83% of the coaches strongly agreed or agreed that they have the coaching skills needed to be an effective reading coach, that they can support teachers in preparing lesson plans focused on equitable reading instruction, that they give teachers feedback on differentiating reading instruction for their students, that they give teachers feedback about using data about their students' reading to plan for and implement equitable reading instruction, they are able to provide the teachers they coach with non-judgmental feedback about their reading instruction, and they are able to build trust and rapport with the teachers they coach. 75% of the coaches strongly agreed or agreed that they encourage teachers to engage in continuous reflection about their reading instruction, and they give teachers feedback on connecting reading instruction to their students' interests, backgrounds, and experiences. 67% strongly agreed or agreed that they help teachers identify the professional development they need to engage in equitable reading instruction. 58% strongly agreed or agreed that they give teachers feedback on scaffolding reading instruction to provide all students access to grade-level texts.

The survey had five open-ended questions. For one question on how coaching has been supportive to improve equitable reading instruction at their school, one coach shared "I have conducted PDs with teachers at both scale up and modeled school on using Lesson Progress Charts, this have really allow me to know which teacher is doing very well and who needs more supports in terms of lesson delivery as well as intervention." Another coach said, "We have a RTI team that was created this year to train the Regular Teachers in the Model school and the Scale Out school. This team will help monitor and assess these 2 schools in Project Lift FSM."

On reflecting on their coaching skills to support teachers, one coach shared, "Able to provide feedback positively and openly to teachers so that we will be able to maintain the alliance building within our network. I always encourage and motivate them to be active and teach with fidelity. I put up incentives or prizes to those that did best according to students' performance on assessments." Another coach shared, "Building good rapport with teachers so that they are more open with feedback and training. Modeling for new teachers on how to implement the programs with fidelity."

The coaches also reflected on the support they need to perform their coaching effectively. Coaches talked about needing more practice, teamwork, team ethics, workshops, and full support from National and State. One coach said, "I need TA support to make me a better coach." Coaches also reflected on how their coaching could be improved to enhance equitable reading instruction at their school. One coach shared, "I need to learn more about effective reading strategies to be able to coach the teachers at my school(s)." Another coach said, "Coaching refresher training and having less responsibilities not related to coaching so I can do more coaching."

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

PD and TA Survey Data: In this reporting period, evaluation data was collected on the TA/PD provided to the coaches in each state to address the outcome related to implementing core reading programs with fidelity. At this point in time, data regarding participants' knowledge gain was the focus and provides the groundwork for assessing fidelity in the spring of the current school year.

A common survey was used to collect data on the knowledge gained as a result of the TA/PD. Nineteen (19) coaches responded to the survey which included a retrospective pre/post item about specific skills or knowledge gained on: coaching practices, core instruction, intervention and progress monitoring, and elements of explicit instruction. The scale used to report their level of knowledge before and after was: 1(none), 2(low), 3(moderate), and 4(high). An analysis was conducted to determine the percentage of respondents who rated themselves as either moderate or high after the TA/PD sessions. A brief summary of the results by each skill/knowledge area follows.

Coaching Practices: Twenty-one percent (21%) of respondents rated their knowledge as moderate before the session and 100% rated it as either moderate or high after.

Core Instruction: Forty-seven percent (47%) of respondents rated their knowledge as moderate before the session and 95% rated it as either moderate or high after. Of note, 63% rated their knowledge as high.

Intervention and Progress Monitoring: This was an area in which UOG provided more TA, and the respondent ratings before may reflect this as there were some respondents who rated themselves as high (6%). This increased to 100% after the session.

Elements of Explicit Instruction: Before the training, 25% of respondents rated their knowledge as moderate or high. This increased to 100% after the session.

Taken together, the results of the surveys indicate that 98% of the coaches were knowledgeable about the elements of effective implementation of the reading programs.

#### Teacher Interviews:

As part of the onsite TA/PD, evaluation data was collected from teachers in each of the States using a standard survey instrument developed by the external evaluators. The protocol solicited feedback on perceived benefits and challenges of implementing the reading programs. Reflecting on the benefits to their teaching, many commented that they are feeling more confident in their practice. One teacher pointed out that she has learned many specific strategies that help her with all of her students. Regarding positive outcomes for their students, teachers noted specific skill development (e.g., vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension). Others cited benefits for students in the areas of engagement and positive behavior in the classroom. Teachers described a 'safe place' for students to learn and make mistakes without ridicule from fellow students. The routines and practices in the core instruction was also conducive to an orderly class environment. Challenges noted by the teachers ranged from very specific (e.g., access to materials) to more systemic issues (e.g., teacher turnover, absenteeism, more family engagement).

State Self-Reflection: These data will be conducted in July of 2024.

Collaboration Survey: A collaboration survey was disseminated this reporting period. The survey is based upon Assessing Your Collaboration self-evaluation tool and includes seven domains related to collaborating on an initiative. The collaboration survey was used to collect data to report on the performance measure "To what extent do RTI team members, NDOE staff, and school staff report support for implementation of early literacy instruction and interventions." 16 responses were received from staff in all four states and NDOE.

An overall percentage of agreement that collaboration was in place was calculated across states. Analysis indicated that 47.3% of the respondents strongly agreed that there were effective collaborations across the seven domains that included Communication, Sustainability, Research & Evaluation, Resources, Connectedness, Leadership, and Understanding Community. 52.67% of the respondents somewhat agreed that there were effective collaborations across the seven domains. There were no disagreement ratings that were provided by the states.

Several examples were cited on how the collaboration in states have been successful that included:

1. At the state level, the team here participates in all RTI trainings, and they visit the school and help out the teachers with the process of how to deliver lessons based on what they learn from all the RTI trainings.

2. With national help, we have more understanding of what they expect from us, and from the school level we have consistent monthly Professional Development (PD) with the teachers to improve fidelity in the program implementation.

The states noted that certain things can be improved to make collaborations more successful. These included: improve providing supports to schools, be more consistent in collaborative efforts from national to state and to school level, and more training on how exactly the coaches will train the teachers to do the right teaching process in the classroom.

Family Surveys: To ease the burden on parents and families, evaluators have moved to collecting family survey data every other year, as parents also respond to the Indicator 8 survey data annually. This data will again be reported in the next SSIP annual submission.

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

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

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

YES

### **If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.**

The results of the performance measure data indicate that implementation is on track and no changes are needed at this time. Although data that is reported indicated a drop in student performance, it is because the data from one state that did not consistently implement the project activities are still included in the calculation. Additional coaching support have been identified and will be utilized in this one state to ensure consistent implementation of coaching support to the school and proper screenings and performance data are collected and reported. Therefore, FSM will continue to implement SSIP without any modification.

## **Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

### **Description of Stakeholder Input**

As the SEA, NDOE facilitates and solicits broad stakeholder input for FSM's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) development. The FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team is comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils and Special Education Programs, including LEA general education administrators. This leadership team serves as FSM's broad stakeholder group for its SPP and APR development and this meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education. In addition, the FSM RTI initiative or FSM's Project Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow (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).

NDOE facilitated public hearing in all four LEAs to present FFY2023 IDEA Part B grant application and other special education program information with parents, service providers, and the wider community. Although no policies and procedures were revised requiring public awareness and input, the public hearing opportunities allowed the parents and community members to learn about their respective Local Performance Plan (LPP) and accomplishments and challenges. Input from the audiences were documented and considered by each LEA and the SEA in the development of the new LPP or the SPP and APR.

A summary of the public hearings held at the LEAs are as follows:

1. Chuuk State: May 10-11, 2023 on the islands of Kuchua, Tonoas and Fonomo, Udot. There were a total of 114 participants with 60 parents, 42 service providers, and 12 students.

2. Kosrae State: May 11, 2023 at Tofol, Lelu (capital of Kosrae and all four municipals were invited/participated). Total of 70 participants, with 33 parents

and 37 service providers.

3. Pohnpei State: May 15-17, 2023 at Enipein, Kitti, Nett, and Saladak, U. Total of 233 participants, with 160 parents and 73 service providers.

4. Yap State: May 13 & 15, 2023 at Ablul, Tomil and Dinay, Rull. Total of 96 participants, with 38 parents, 24 service providers, and 34 students.

For the development of FSM's FFY 2022 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP (Indicator 17) report, NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

1. On July 5 & 6, 2023, NDOE Coordinators and LEA Coordinators and key staffs and Guam CEDDERS consultants convened in Kosrae during the 2023 Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC). Meeting outcomes included initial discussion and planning on the FFY23 SPP/APR, agreement and finalization of the 2023-2024 LPP and quarterly reporting requirements and template, further revisions on the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) procedures, planned next steps for the USDOE OSEP DMS visit, and prioritized SEA and LEA areas for improvement.

2. On August 21-25, 2023, National Coordinators, Guam CEDDERS, State Education Directors, and CELPP scholars and mentors met in Kosrae for a CELPP summer institute. 8 CELPP scholars completed the 2-year training with a capstone project to develop a leadership portfolio. As a training requirement, all scholars learn about the NDOE SPP and APR and each develop a research project that were presented at this summer institute. All presentations were documented and recommendations were considered at the SEA as well as LEA level and during the preparation of this FFY23 SPP/APR.

3. On September 11-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR and Project LIFT leadership teams convened in Chuuk for the first formal FFY23 SPP/APR meeting. At this convening, the applicable Indicator performance data were collected from each LEA and compiled into a draft FFY23 SPP/APR report. In addition, the OSEP DMS 2.0 monitoring framework and protocols were presented to these two leadership teams. Other meeting outcomes include discussions on the interim data collection process and tools, onsite verification and monitoring schedule of LEAs, continued revisions on the CIMS, overview of indicator measurements and related instructions on data collection and analysis. UOG CEDDERS consultants provided onsite Project LIFT TA to Chuuk and presented FSM LIFT status and calendaring of onsite TA to other LEAs. Participants to this meeting included UOG CEDDERS consultants (3), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (19), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (7), and Yap State (8). The 45 participants included Advisory Chairpersons/parents, Director of Education and General Education Administrators/Specialists and Classroom Teachers. On September 13, 2023 from 2-4pm, NDOE (1), Chuuk Special Education (2), Kosrae DOE (1), and UOG CEDDERS (1) met with private school principals and key staffs (6) to present and held an open discussions on parentally-placed private school children with disabilities.

4. December 12-15, 2023, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held second meeting in Pohnpei. Meeting outcomes were first draft of FSM FFY23 SPP/APR completed and incomplete data and slippage notes presented by LEAs, CIMS procedures further discussed in relation to General Supervision and implementation implications beginning 2023-2024, further discussions and preparations on the DMS 2.0 calendar and expectations, prioritization of improvement activities under the SPP/APR, Project LIFT, and other national and state priorities. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultant (1), NDOE staff (8), Chuuk State (9), Kosrae State (9), Pohnpei State (15), and Yap State (6). Among these participants from the states were 2 Advisory Chairpersons, 4 DOE Administrators, and 2 DOE Specialists.

5. On January 24-26, 2024, NDOE SPP/APR leadership team held its final meeting in Pohnpei to confirm and verify all indicator performance data and explanation of slippage for required indicators, agreement on Indicator 17 data and implications on SSIP and local systemic improvement plan priorities and improvement activities, and finalize national and state-level focused areas for improvement. In attendance were UOG CEDDERS consultants (2), NDOE staff (4), Chuuk State (6), Kosrae State (4), Pohnpei State (11), and Yap State (6). Among these state participants were 3 Advisory Chairpersons and 1 DOE Administrator.

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

Stakeholder input was built into review and revision of the evaluation for this next SSIP cycle. External evaluators continued the practice of convening state teams to review their data and reflect on implementation challenges and successes, and plan for the coming school year. Evaluators support state use of evaluation data via email correspondences and SDOE evaluation meetings. In addition, evaluation data is presented during the FSM NDOE APR meetings held during the reporting period.

In addition to State focused discussions and decision making, stakeholders provided input to NDOE outcomes and strategies to guide SSIP implementation. Through cross-State stakeholder discussions, stakeholders continued to articulate the challenges and need for further TA/PD to support State implementation and scale up of RTI to sustain improved reading for students in the SSIP schools. To address this concern, NDOE established a new contract with the University of Guam to provide professional development and technical assistance to support implementation of Project LIFT activities.

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

YES

#### **Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

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

As described above, the stakeholder engagement process included voicing concerns as well as discussion about addressing or understanding those concerns.

#### **Additional Implementation Activities**

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

No new activities planned for next fiscal year.

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

No new activities planned for next fiscal year.

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

While common forms and timelines for data collection are in place, there continues to be uneven adherence to the timelines, due to contextual factors within each State. As was reported in the last SSIP and continues for this SSIP, RTI teams note that adequate time for reflection and action planning is a challenge to SSIP implementation. To address this, the external evaluators conducted frequent, or as needed, meetings with the NDOE liaisons and

State RTI teams, providing opportunities to review and discuss data and implementation activities as a group in order to plan throughout the year. Meetings of all State RTI teams and NDOE staff are held twice per year to ensure continued input to overall SSIP implementation.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).**

**17 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**17 - OSEP Response**

**17 - Required Actions**

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

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

#### **Certify**

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

#### **Select the certifier's role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

#### **Name:**

Arthur Albert

#### **Title:**

Assistant Secretary

#### **Email:**

aalbert@dss.edu.fm

#### **Phone:**

+16919211610

#### **Submitted on:**

**Determination Enclosures**

**RDA Matrix**

## 2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

**Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)**

Percentage (%)	Determination

**Results and Compliance Overall Scoring**

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
<b>Results</b>			
<b>Compliance</b>			

**2024 Part B Results Matrix**

**Reading Assessment Elements**

Reading Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Average Percentage of 3rd through 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments		
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		

**Math Assessment Elements**

Math Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Average Percentage of 3rd through 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments		
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2024: Part B."

**Exiting Data Elements**

<b>Exiting Data Elements</b>	<b>Performance (%)</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out Over Previous 3 Years</b>		
<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma Over Previous 3 Years**</b>		

\*\*When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, "the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential."

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (2)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (3)	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.			
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.			
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.			
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation			
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday			
Indicator 13: Secondary transition			
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data			
Timely State Complaint Decisions			
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions			
Longstanding Noncompliance			
Specific Conditions			
Uncorrected identified noncompliance			

(2) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: [https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024\\_Part-B\\_SPP-APR\\_Measurement\\_Table.pdf](https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf)

(3) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are  $\geq 5\%$  and  $< 10\%$  for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and  $\geq 90\%$  and  $< 95\%$  for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

## Data Rubric

FFY 2022 APR (1)

### Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	N/A	0
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	N/A	0
10	N/A	0
11	1	1
12	N/A	0
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1

### APR Score Calculation

<b>Subtotal</b>	17
<b>Timely Submission Points</b> - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
<b>Grand Total</b> - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	22

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	26.00

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

**Indicator Calculation**

A. APR Grand Total	22
B. 618 Grand Total	26.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	48.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	4
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
<b>Denominator</b>	48.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	1.0000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00

**(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.**

## APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

### SPP/APR Data

**1) Valid and Reliable Data** - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

### Part B 618 Data

**1) Timely** – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files or the entire *EMAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	8/30/2023
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	2/21/2024
Part B Exiting	C009	2/21/2024
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	2/21/2024
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	1/10/2024
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS	11/15/2023
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS	5/3/2023

**2) Complete Data** – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to *EDFacts* aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in EMAPS. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

**3) Passed Edit Check** – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection



## How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>