

FM Part B

FFY2014 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

This Executive Summary includes a description of Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2014. A description of FSM's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement in the development and review of the SPP and APR, and how FSM will report the SPP and APR to the Public are provided separately within this Introduction section of FSM's FFY 2014 APR.

In FFY 2013, with input from stakeholders, FSM identified targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2018. This FFY 2014 APR includes current performance data for 13 of the 16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 16. As per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to FSM. In addition, Indicators 3A and 4B measures do not apply to FSM. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, FSM reports FFY 2014 data to determine if FSM met its FFY 2014 target, provides an explanation of slippage if FSM did not meet its target, and responds to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2015 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for FSM's FFY 2013 SPP/APR. Although FSM did not meet all its results indicator targets in FFY 2014, the stakeholders recommended not to revise the targets at this time.

As required, for Indicator 17, FSM's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), FSM will submit its FFY 2014 performance and SSIP Phase II, including a description of FSM's infrastructure development, implementation strategies of evidence-based practices in the pilot schools and an evaluation plan, no later than April 1, 2016.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

General Supervision System:

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

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

FSM's administrative structure for the implementation of IDEA includes the NDOE as the SEA and the four FSM islands states as the LEAs. NDOE has in place its FSM special education procedural manual and notice of procedural safeguards, consistent with the IDEA requirements, disseminated and implemented in all four LEAs. NDOE also has in place a dispute resolution system that meets the IDEA requirements and implemented in each LEA.

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

Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, for child-specific regulatory noncompliance, demonstration of verified correction is 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 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.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

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

Given FSM’s unique geographic context, NDOE has in place a mechanism to ensure timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to each island state/LEA. NDOE implements a reporting mechanism to identify and prioritize technical assistance and training needs in each LEA through the annual LEA application for IDEA Part B funding and quarterly progress reporting.

The LEA application includes the development and implementation of a Local Performance Plan (LPP) that is aligned to the FSM SPP and developed with stakeholder input. Each LEA has in place a special education advisory council that meets the membership requirements of the IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education. The LEA special education advisory council reviews LEA data and performance on the FSM SPP indicator measures and provides input to LEA target setting and development and implementation of improvement activities. The LEA targets must align and support meeting FSM’s SPP targets. The budget within the LEA application is outlined to reflect funding support for the LEA prioritized improvement activities. Each LEA is required to report quarterly on their progress data related to the SPP indicator and implementation of their improvement activities.

NDOE convenes the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team, comprised of representatives from NDOE and the four LEA Special Education Advisory Councils. The Team reviews LEA LPP data and information for technical assistance and training implementation and needs. The Team identifies LEA-specific needs and national initiatives for allocating resources. NDOE serves as the conduit for accessing local, regional, and national resources, including OSEP-funded centers, to support the LEA-specific and national technical assistance and training needs.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

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

Given FSM’s unique geographic context, NDOE has mechanisms in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities. With input from the four island states or LEAs, NDOE establishes the minimum professional standards for all teachers and the content standards and assessment for all students. In addition, Title 40 of the FSM code requires all schools in the FSM to meet required minimum standards and undergo a process of accreditation. The purpose of FSM’s accreditation is to ensure all schools provide all students an environment that is conducive to learning, with the ultimate goal to raise the level of student academic performance. This purpose is especially important for effectively providing appropriate services for children with disabilities, as the majority of FSM’s children with disabilities are in general education classrooms for the 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 work of the school, including student achievement and attendance, teacher qualifications and professional development, and resource inventories. These data are analyzed to show trends, strengths, and weaknesses, and to prioritize professional development for administrators and teachers to ensure FSM reaches the ultimate goal of raising academic achievement for all students.

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

NDOE, FSM's conduit for accessing local, regional, and national resources, has engaged in several OSEP-funded regional professional development grants to improve the knowledge and skills of service providers working with children with disabilities. The Pacific Assessment Consortium (PAC6) served to support the development and implementation of FSM's Alternate Assessment based on Alternate Achievement Standards (AA-AAS), which included teacher training, and the Pacific Consortium for Instructional Materials Accessibility Project (Pacific CIMAP) provided technical support and training for teachers and related service personnel to ensure children with print disabilities have the required timely accessible materials. The Pacific Vision Instruction Project (Pacific VIP), an OSEP personnel preparation grant, is another regional project with the outcome of developing personnel in the area of vision education and orientation and mobility for providing educational services for children with visual impairments. These OSEP-funded grants, to name a few, have had significant impact on FSM's personnel capacity to provide appropriate services for children with disabilities.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

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

For the development of FSM's FFY 2014 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase II (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- In May 2015, NDOE convened a LEA Special Education Coordinators Meeting while attending the PEPNET2 Institute which was held in conjunction with PACRIM Conference on Disability on Honolulu, Hawaii. The meeting reviewed students' performance data on Indicators 1-7 and 11, 13, and 14. The meeting attendants also held preliminary discussions on Indicator 8 data and possible options to improve use of survey outcomes to improve delivery of services. Updates of FSM's Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow (LIFT) project was presented and plan for summer 2015 training for LIFT Coaches and Teachers during Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC) was also discussed.
- In July 2015, FSM NDOE facilitated a stakeholder meeting with LEA Special Education Coordinators and key staffs, LIFT Principals, Coaches, and Teachers during MTEC 2015 held on Pohnpei. The team reviewed performance data in relation to the SPP Indicators, including Indicator 17.

- In August 2015, FSM NDOE facilitated a leadership meeting during FSM's biennial Interagency Leadership conference with LEA Special Education Coordinators and key staffs, Advisory Council representatives, parents, LIFT Principals, Coaches, Teachers, and General Education administrators. The team reviewed LEA implementation activities on both compliance and performance indicators. LEA performances on the SSIP Coherent Improvement Strategies were also discussed to ensure LEA implement strategic activities that are targeted on FSM's SiMR. The team also review child find data with emphasis on early screening and identification of birth to 3, which is the main focus of FSM's Interagency Coordinating Council.
- In December 2015, FSM participated in the OSEP/NCSI Meeting on Guam. The FSM team reviewed Indicator 17 performance data and implementation activities. The FSM team also held a one-day meeting to review APR performance data and prepare for its APR Leadership meeting to be held in February 2016 in Pohnpei.
- In February 2016, NDOE convened the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team in Pohnpei, FSM for final considerations for FSM's FFY 2014 APR, including explanation of slippage for FSM's FFY 2014 indicator performance that didn't meet target. The team reviewed FSM's performance on the established targets for Indicators 1-16 and discussed reasons for slippage where applicable. FSM's performance data were verified against all relevant data sources and official submissions to OSEP. Trend data were reviewed and discussions on targets for LEA and FSM as a whole was discussed. The FSM SPP/APR Leadership Team agreed to continue with the SPP targets while adjustments for LEA targets on certain Indicators will have to be made.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 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 2013 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b) (1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

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

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2008

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			75.00%	76.00%	76.00%	77.00%	79.00%	81.00%	82.00%	56.00%
Data		83.00%	87.00%	81.00%	81.00%	95.00%	77.00%	90.00%	82.00%	56.94%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	62.00%	67.00%	72.00%	77.00%	82.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FSM developed its SPP targets with stakeholder input from the National SPP/APR Leadership Team comprised of representatives from the National Department of Education (NDOE) and the four FSM State Special Education Advisory Councils. Given FSM's administrative structure, the National SPP/APR Leadership Team represents FSM's broad stakeholder group which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education.

During the April 2014 National SPP/APR Leadership Team meeting, the team reviewed FSM trend data and US National trend data related to graduation rates, including the one-year lag requirement and target setting. During the October 2014 and January 2015 National meetings, members reviewed the historical data and baseline year presented in GRADS 360. The recommendation to change FSM's baseline year to FFY 2008 was discussed. Members provided input to target setting based on FSM's recommendation for the FFY 2008 performance to serve as FSM's baseline data.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
			null	55
			null	59
				Calculate <input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Alternate Data

As one of the Freely Associated States (FAS), FSM does not report graduation data to the Department under Title 1 of the ESEA. FSM therefore continues to use the senior enrollment calculation to determine FSM's annual graduation rate for youth with IEPs graduating with a regular high school diploma. Following the one-year lag data requirement, FSM used its 2013-2014 data to report in this FFY 2014 APR for Indicator 1. In 2013-2014, there was a total of 59 enrolled seniors with an IEP; of which, 55 seniors with an IEP graduated

with a high school diploma. The total number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular high school diploma is consistent with the 618 reported exit data.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data
55	59	56.94%	62.00%	93.22%

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

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

It should be noted that in November 2015, Chuuk State Board of Education approved the change in credit accrual for high school graduation with a diploma. Effective school year 2015-2016, high school students in Chuuk State are required to earn 25 high school course credits, instead of 22, in order to graduate with a high school diploma, per Policy 6.5: *Requirement for Graduation*.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2008

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			3.00%	2.50%	2.50%	2.00%	1.00%	0%	2.00%	10.00%
Data		1.00%	4.00%	3.00%	3.00%	7.70%	2.50%	3.00%	8.00%	9.91%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	9.00%	7.00%	5.00%	3.00%	2.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FSM developed its SPP targets with stakeholder input from the National SPP/APR Leadership Team comprised of representatives from the National Department of Education (NDOE) and the four FSM State Special Education Advisory Councils. Given FSM's administrative structure, the National SPP/APR Leadership Team represents FSM's broad stakeholder group which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education.

During the April 2014 National SPP/APR Leadership Team meeting, the team reviewed FSM trend data and US National trend data related to drop-out rates, including the one-year lag requirement and target setting. The team also reviewed the proposed options for reporting Indicator 2 drop-out data. The team recommended to maintain the same reporting methodology - Option 2.

During the October 2014 and January 2015 National meetings, members reviewed the historical data and baseline year presented in GRADS 360. The recommendation to change FSM's baseline year to the FFY 2008 was discussed. Members provided input to target setting based on FSM's recommendation for the FFY 2008 performance to serve as FSM's baseline data.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of high school students with IEPs	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
98	432	9.91%	9.00%	22.69%

Use a different calculation methodology

- Change numerator description in data table
- Change denominator description in data table

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

FSM chooses Option 2 to report Indicator 2 data. FSM does not report drop-out data to the Department under Title 1 of ESEA. FSM therefore continues to use the high school enrollment calculation to determine FSM's annual drop-out rate for youth with IEPs in high school. Data for this indicator are "one-year lag" data. FSM used the 2013-2014 high school drop-out and enrollment data to determine FSM's data for this FFY 2014 APR for Indicator 2.

In 2013-2014, the total number of youth with IEPs in high school was 432; of which, 98 were youth with IEPs who dropped out from high school. For Indicator 2, 98 was the number used as the numerator representing youth with IEPs who dropped out of high school, consistent with the 618 exit data. The total number of youth with IEPs enrolled in high school was 432, which was used as the denominator.

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 drop out.

Explanation of Slippage

During the FSM National Coordinators and Leadership Meetings, stakeholders discussed reasons for FSM's slippage in drop-out rates from FFY 2013 to FFY 2014. Stakeholders agreed that possible reasons for the slippage include:

- FSM's compulsory age for education is six (6) through 14, with the exception of Pohnpei State which is through age 16. As students complete their elementary years at 8th grade, some choose not to continue in high school as it is not mandatory. They choose to work or help out the family on their island.
- Grade Point Average (GPA) and attendance requirements to receive high school credits discourage students to continue in high school. Students typically drop-out during the first semester and beginning of the second semester after entering high school. In one state, policy for high school credit attainment for all students requires at least a 2.5 GPA. Students who do not meet the GPA requirement have to repeat the course/s, which can discourage them to continue coming to school. In addition, excessive absences result in students not receiving high school course credits. Special education program personnel conducts follow-up calls for students with excessive absences to discuss reasons for not coming to school, but the students still do not come to school.
- Relocation to another island for high school is a challenge that discourages students to enroll and stay in high school. In three states, outer island high schools are located on certain islands. All students entering high school would typically attend the high school closest to their island, which sometimes would require them to leave their island and stay in the high school dorms, with relatives, or volunteer host families. In one state, the high schools in the lagoon islands stopped providing dorm services and meal programs, which meant that students would have to stay with relatives or volunteer host families. Also, some students who live on the same island as the high school would have to walk a distance to the high school or take a boat around the island to get to the high school. In this situation, access to the high school campus for all students can be challenging given the road and weather conditions for walking or using the boat. Students then choose not to go to school to work or help out the family on their island.

Stakeholders discussed the needed supports provided to high school students with IEPs, especially in the transition from 8th grade to 9th grade to keep them in school. Some high schools offer tutoring support, which helps the students with their coursework. In one state, community-based education programs for job shadowing activities are offered to high school juniors and seniors. During the meeting, it was discussed that these community-based education programs could possibly be offered for 9th and 10th graders to get them interested in staying in school to explore job opportunities for after high school.

Stakeholders also discussed the outer island high school situation in three of the four states. The special education programs in these states are working with their general education counterparts to address this system issue. As mentioned, all students entering high school require some students to travel or stay on another island.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

No longer required due to passage of ESSA.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

This indicator is not applicable.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			65.00%	70.00%	80.00%	90.00%	100%	100%	100%	54.00%
			Data		41.00%	55.00%	66.00%	41.30%	56.50%	89.40%	59.00%	31.00%	54.56%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			65.00%	70.00%			100%	100%	100%	55.00%
			Data		39.00%	56.00%	55.00%			71.00%	62.00%	34.00%	55.28%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Math	A ≥ Overall	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FSM developed its SPP targets with stakeholder input from the National SPP/APR Leadership Team comprised of representatives from the National Department of Education (NDOE) and the four FSM State Special Education Advisory Councils. Given FSM's administrative structure, the National SPP/APR Leadership Team represents FSM's broad stakeholder group which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education.

During the April 2014 National SPP/APR Leadership Team meeting, the team reviewed FSM trend data and US National trend data related to state-wide assessment participation rates. During the October 2014 and January 2015 National meetings, members reviewed the historical data and baseline year presented in GRADS 360. Members provided recommendations for target setting, including consideration for the overall FSM National priority to have all students participate in the FSM state-wide assessment. It was therefore agreed that beginning FFY 2014, the target set for Indicator 3B, state-wide assessment participation, shall be 100%.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014	FFY 2014 Data
------------	--------------------	------------------------------	----------------	----------	---------------

	with IEPs	Participating		Target*	
A Overall	543	272	54.56%	100%	50.09%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

FSM reported slippage in reading assessment participation by 4.47% from 54.56% in FFY 2013 to 50.09% in FFY 2014. This slight slippage represents those students who were absent during the testing period. Stakeholders discussed two main reasons for the slippage:

- The original scheduled dates for the NMCT administration on the outer island atolls were changed due to the ship or boat schedule. Some schools were not aware of the changed dates and did not have enough time to prepare students for the new testing schedule.
- Three of the four states did not have scheduled make-up tests for students who were absent during the testing days. This applied to all students absent.

The FSM National priority is to have all schools participate in the nation-wide assessment. This is why for Indicator 3B, FSM's target is set at 100%, which aligns with FSM's National priority. During the FSM National Leadership Meeting, efforts to address Indicator 3B slippage and for FSM to meet its target include working with the ship and boat schedule and working with the National and state assessment personnel to schedule make-up test times in all states. In addition, the special education program will work with parents of children with disabilities in the tested grades to build awareness of the importance of participating in the nation-wide assessment.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	721	390	55.28%	100%	54.09%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

FSM reported slippage in math assessment participation by 1.19% from 55.28% in FFY 2013 to 54.09% in FFY 2014. This slight slippage represents those students who were absent during the testing period. Stakeholders discussed two main reasons for the slippage:

- The original scheduled dates for the NMCT administration on the outer island atolls were changed due to the ship or boat schedule. Some schools were not aware of the changed dates and did not have enough time to prepare students for the new testing schedule.
- Three of the four states did not have scheduled make-up tests for students who were absent during the testing days. This applied to all students absent.

The FSM National priority is to have all schools participate in the nation-wide assessment. This is why for Indicator 3B, FSM's target is set at 100%, which aligns with FSM's National priority. During the FSM National Leadership Meeting, efforts to address Indicator 3B slippage and for FSM to meet its target include working with the ship and boat schedule and working with the National and state assessment personnel to schedule make-up test times in all states. In addition, the special education program will work with parents of children with disabilities in the tested grades to build awareness of the importance of participating in the nation-wide assessment.

Public Reporting Information

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

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

FSM's public reports of assessment results have been posted on <http://www.fsmed.fm> and <http://www.fsmsped.org/dashboard>.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			8.00%	9.00%	12.00%	4.00%	5.00%	12.00%	12.00%	2.00%
			Data		7.00%	8.00%	3.00%	1.20%	4.60%	3.40%	1.80%	0%	2.84%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			4.00%	5.00%			5.00%	8.00%	8.00%	2.00%
			Data		3.00%	0%	4.00%			2.00%	1.00%	0.90%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	4.00%	6.00%	8.00%	10.00%	10.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	4.00%	6.00%	8.00%	10.00%	10.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FSM developed its SPP targets with stakeholder input from the National SPP/APR Leadership Team comprised of representatives from the National Department of Education (NDOE) and the four FSM State Special Education Advisory Councils. Given FSM’s administrative structure, the National SPP/APR Leadership Team represents FSM’s broad stakeholder group which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education.

During the April 2014 National SPP/APR Leadership Team meeting, the team reviewed FSM trend data and US National trend data related to state-wide assessment proficiency rates. During the October 2014 and January 2015 National meetings, members reviewed the historical data and baseline year presented in GRADS 360. Members provided recommendations for target setting, including consideration for the development and implementation of FSM’s Response to Intervention (RTI) Initiative - Project LIFT, which serves as FSM’s SSIP that focuses on improving the instructional framework for teaching and learning. Members recommended that targets be set with realistic expectations given FSM’s current infrastructure, and as Project LIFT is implemented and reviewed, the targets can be revisited, if needed.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	assigned				
A Overall	272	9	2.84%	4.00%	3.31%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	390	8	0%	4.00%	2.05%

Public Reporting Information

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

FSM's public reports of assessment results have been posted on <http://www.fsmed.fm> and <http://www.fsmsped.org/dashboard>.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FSM developed its SPP targets with stakeholder input from the National SPP/APR Leadership Team comprised of representatives from the National Department of Education (NDOE) and the four FSM State Special Education Advisory Councils. Given FSM's administrative structure, the National SPP/APR Leadership Team represents FSM's broad stakeholder group which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education.

During the April 2014 National SPP/APR Leadership Team meeting, the team reviewed FSM trend data and US National trend data related to long-term suspension/expulsion rates, including the one-year lag requirement and target setting. During the October 2014 and January 2015 National meetings, members reviewed the historical data and baseline year presented in GRADS 360. With input from the team, FSM maintained the same definition for "significant discrepancy" as in previous reporting years.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	1	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

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 LEAs in FSM; while still reporting FSM as a unitary system - one district.

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

In 2013-2014, FSM did not report any children with disabilities having suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days, similar reporting to previous years.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

Per OSEP's instructions, Indicator 4B does not apply to the Pacific entities, inclusive of FSM.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

This indicator is not applicable.

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs 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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2005	Target ≥			97.00%	97.25%	97.75%	97.70%	98.00%	97.10%	97.10%	91.75%
		Data		93.00%	90.00%	84.00%	84.00%	91.00%	95.00%	94.00%	94.20%	95.31%
B	2005	Target ≤			0.25%	0.25%	0.25%	0.25%	0.25%	0.25%	0.25%	2.70%
		Data		0%	3.00%	7.00%	6.00%	2.80%	2.00%	2.50%	1.70%	0.99%
C	2005	Target ≤			2.50%	2.25%	1.75%	1.70%	1.50%	1.00%	1.00%	3.00%
		Data		7.00%	6.00%	7.00%	8.00%	6.00%	3.00%	3.60%	3.80%	2.87%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	92.00%	92.50%	92.75%	93.00%	93.50%
Target B ≤	2.20%	1.70%	1.20%	1.00%	0%
Target C ≤	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FSM developed its SPP targets with stakeholder input from the National SPP/APR Leadership Team comprised of representatives from the National Department of Education (NDOE) and the four FSM State Special Education Advisory Councils. Given FSM's administrative structure, the National SPP/APR Leadership Team represents FSM's broad stakeholder group which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education.

During the April 2014 National SPP/APR Leadership Team meeting, the team reviewed FSM trend data and US National trend data related to School-Age LRE rates. During the October 2014 and January 2015 National meetings, members reviewed the historical data and baseline year presented in GRADS 360. As discussed, FSM has been able to perform better than the US National trend data in relation to School-Age LRE rates.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child	6/4/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	1,928	null

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)				
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	1,813	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	15	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	13	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	n	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	66	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	1,813	1,928	95.31%	92.00%	94.04%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	15	1,928	0.99%	2.20%	0.78%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	79	1,928	2.87%	3.00%	4.10%

Explanation of C Slippage

FSM reported slight slippage by 1.23% from 2.87% in FFY 2013 to 4.10% in FFY 2014. It is understood that the determination of where students receive their special education and related services is an individualized decision based on the IEP Team. Of the the 79 students with IEPs in the 5C setting, 83.54% or 66 students with IEPs received their special education and related services in their home, while 16.46% or 13 students with IEPs were in a special school.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

--

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2011	Target ≥									88.70%	75.00%
		Data									88.50%	80.30%
B	2011	Target ≤									0.60%	0.70%
		Data									0.70%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	75.00%	80.00%	85.00%	88.00%	90.00%
Target B ≤	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%	0.60%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FSM developed its SPP targets with stakeholder input from the National SPP/APR Leadership Team comprised of representatives from the National Department of Education (NDOE) and the four FSM State Special Education Advisory Councils. Given FSM's administrative structure, the National SPP/APR Leadership Team represents FSM's broad stakeholder group which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education.

During the April 2014 National SPP/APR Leadership Team meeting, the team reviewed FSM trend data and US National trend data related to Preschool LRE rates. During the October 2014 and January 2015 National meetings, members reviewed the historical data and baseline year presented in GRADS 360. As discussed, FSM has been able to perform better than the US National trend data in relation to Preschool LRE rates.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	133	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec	7/2/2015	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	90	null

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
C089; Data group 613)				
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	n	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b2. Number of children attending separate school	n	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	90	133	75.98%	75.00%	67.67%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	3	133	0%	0.70%	2.26%

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

Explanation of A Slippage

FSM reported slippage for 6A by 8.31% from 75.98% in FFY 2013 to 67.67% in FFY 2014. It should be noted that 67.67% represents the majority of FSM's preschoolers with IEPs receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood programs, which is higher than the national data of 50%. It is understood that where preschoolers with IEPs receive their special education and related services is an individual decision by the IEP team. Further, in the islands, the home environment, considered "other" setting, is a typical environment for all preschoolers.

The reason for the slippage could be attributed to the decrease in the overall number of preschoolers with disabilities served. In FFY 2013, there were 179 preschoolers with IEPs compared to 133 in FFY 2014. The total number of preschoolers with IEPs who received their special education and related services in other settings (special school or home) remained the same at 43 in FFY 2013 and FFY 2014. The difference is in the drop in the number accounted for under 6A from 136 in FFY 2013 to 90 in FFY 2014. This difference represents the preschoolers who moved on to first grade or who turned six years old.

Explanation of B Slippage

FSM reported slippage for 6B by 2.26% from 0% in FFY 2013 to 2.26% in FFY 2014, which represents three preschoolers with IEPs. It should be noted that FSM's FFY 2014 performance of 2.26% is significantly lower than the national data of 22%. It is understood that where preschoolers with IEPs receive their special education and related services is an individual IEP team decision. For the three preschoolers with IEPs accounted for under 6B, the IEP team determined that, at this time, a special school environment is the most appropriate setting for them to receive their special education and related services.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2008	Target ≥						79.50%	79.70%	79.70%	79.70%	83.00%
		Data					79.50%	80.30%	89.40%	88.00%	90.20%	83.82%
A2	2008	Target ≥						65.00%	66.00%	66.00%	66.00%	71.00%
		Data					65.00%	48.20%	76.40%	66.00%	68.00%	71.62%
B1	2008	Target ≥						80.00%	80.10%	80.10%	80.10%	78.00%
		Data					80.00%	81.40%	86.20%	89.00%	89.00%	78.57%
B2	2008	Target ≥						65.00%	66.00%	66.00%	66.00%	62.00%
		Data					65.00%	45.80%	76.40%	62.00%	60.00%	62.16%
C1	2008	Target ≥						87.00%	88.00%	88.00%	88.00%	85.00%
		Data					87.00%	81.40%	84.20%	90.00%	92.00%	85.00%
C2	2008	Target ≥						68.30%	68.40%	68.40%	68.40%	75.00%
		Data					68.30%	53.00%	83.30%	65.00%	70.80%	75.68%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	83.00%	83.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Target A2 ≥	71.00%	71.00%	71.00%	71.00%	71.00%
Target B1 ≥	78.25%	78.25%	78.50%	78.50%	80.25%
Target B2 ≥	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%	65.00%	65.25%
Target C1 ≥	85.00%	86.00%	86.00%	87.00%	87.25%
Target C2 ≥	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FSM developed its SPP targets with stakeholder input from the National SPP/APR Leadership Team comprised of representatives from the National Department of Education (NDOE) and the four FSM State Special Education Advisory Councils. Given FSM's administrative structure, the National SPP/APR Leadership Team represents FSM's broad stakeholder group which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education.

During the October 2014 and January 2015 National meetings, members reviewed the FSM trend data and US National trend data related to early childhood outcomes. The team also reviewed the historical data and baseline year presented in GRADS 360. The team recommended targets with consideration to FSM's current performance that is higher than the US National data for five of the six Indicator 7 measures.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	105.00
--	--------

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	13.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	30.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	57.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	5.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	87.00	100.00	83.82%	83.00%	87.00%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	62.00	105.00	71.62%	71.00%	59.05%

Explanation of A2 Slippage

For this reporting period, FSM did not meet the target of 71% with the performance of 59.05%. In FFY 2014, 43/105 or 40.95% of preschoolers showed improved functioning closer to but not sufficient or did not reach their same age peers in the area of positive social emotional development, as shown under progress categories "b" and "c". There were no preschoolers that did not improve in their functioning (category "a").

In comparison to FFY 2013 performance data of 71.62% for this measure, there was a slippage in FFY 2014. Based on the stakeholders' review of the past and present performance, discussions on what might have contributed to the decrease of 12.57% of children that improved in their functioning and reached a level comparable to their same-aged peers. As a result of this discussion, additional data was reviewed on the length of service, disability conditions, and changes within the early childhood special education services within each of the FSM State.

Further analysis indicated that over 70% of the preschoolers who exited this reporting period had early childhood special education services for less than one year. In addition, stakeholders in all FSM states shared that there were early childhood personnel changes and that there seemed to be some inconsistency in completing the entry and exit ratings. It was noted that training is needed around the usage of the ECO tools such as the decision tree in assisting the IEP Teams in determining the appropriate ratings. The reasons for the slippage therefore may be attributed to the short amount of time preschoolers had in accessing early childhood special education services and the need for additional training on the ECO procedures and tools.

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	13.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	41.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	47.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	4.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	88.00	101.00	78.57%	78.25%	87.13%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	51.00	105.00	62.16%	62.00%	48.57%

Explanation of B2 Slippage

For this reporting period, FSM did not meet the target of 62% with its performance of 48.57%. In FFY 2014, 54/105 or 51.43% of preschoolers showed improved functioning closer to but not sufficient or reached their same age peers in the area of acquisition of knowledge and skills, as shown under progress categories "b" and "c". There were no preschoolers that did not improved in their functioning (category "a").

In comparison to FFY 2013 performance data of 62.61% for this measure, there was a slippage in FFY 2014. Based on the stakeholders' review of the past and present performance, discussions on what might have contributed to a decrease of 13.59% of children that improved in their functioning and reached a level comparable to their same-aged peers. As a result of this discussion, additional data was reviewed on the length of service, disability conditions, and changes within the early childhood special education services within each of the FSM States.

Further analysis indicated that over 70% of the preschoolers that exited this reporting period had early childhood special education services for less than one year. In addition, stakeholders in all FSM states shared that there were early childhood personnel changes and that there seemed to be some inconsistency in completing the entry and exit ratings. It was noted that training is needed around the usage of the ECO tools such as the decision tree in assisting the IEP Teams in determining the appropriate ratings. The reasons for the slippage therefore may be attributed to the short amount of time preschoolers had in accessing early childhood special education services and the need for additional training on the ECO procedures and tools.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	14.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	34.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	51.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	6.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	85.00	99.00	85.00%	85.00%	85.86%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	57.00	105.00	75.68%	75.00%	54.29%

Explanation of C2 Slippage

For this reporting period, FSM did not meet the target of 75% with its performance of 54.29%. In FFY 2014, 47/105 or 45.71% of preschoolers showed improved functioning closer but not sufficient or reached their same age peers in the area of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs comparable to their same age peers, as shown under progress categories "b" and "c". There were no preschoolers that did not improved in their functioning (category "a").

In comparison to FFY 2013 performance data of 75.68% for this measure, there is a slippage for FFY 2014. Based on the stakeholders' review of the past and present performance, discussions on what may contributed to decrease of 21.39% percent of children that improved in their functioning and reach a level comparable to their same-aged peers. As a result of this discussion, additional data was reviewed on the length of service, disability conditions, and changes within the early childhood special education services within each of the FSM States.

Further analysis indicated that over 70% of the preschoolers that exited during this reporting period had early childhood special education services for less than one year. In addition, stakeholders in all FSM states shared that there were early childhood personnel changes and that there seemed to be some inconsistency in completing the entry and exit ratings. It was noted that training is needed around the usage of the ECO tools such as the decision tree in assisting the IEP Teams in determining the appropriate ratings.

The reasons for the slippage therefore may be attributed to the short amount of time preschoolers had in accessing early childhood special education services and the need for additional training on the ECO procedures and tools. Another possible reason may be due to the number of preschoolers with significant disabilities who require ongoing and intensive support in self-help and adaptive skills.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

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))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			45.00%	60.00%	75.00%	90.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	59.00%
Data		39.00%	82.00%	83.00%	85.00%	88.00%	65.00%	56.00%	63.00%	59.19%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FSM developed its SPP targets with stakeholder input from the National SPP/APR Leadership Team comprised of representatives from the National Department of Education (NDOE) and the four FSM State Special Education Advisory Councils. Given FSM's administrative structure, the National SPP/APR Leadership Team represents FSM's broad stakeholder group which meets the minimum requirement of the IDEA State Advisory Panel for Special Education.

During the October 2014 and January 2015 National meetings, members reviewed the FSM trend data and US National trend data related to parent involvement survey results. The team also reviewed the historical data and baseline year presented in GRADS 360 before providing input to FSM's target setting for Indicator 8.

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
7033.00	12006.00	59.19%	60.00%	58.58%

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 2014 was the same as in previous years. The survey was an adapted version of the 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.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

FSM's FFY 2014 response rate of 94.83% (2001/2110) represents an increase by 1.94% from 92.89% (1962/2112) in FFY 2013; an increase of 39 parent respondents. The overall number of respondents is significant given the geographic remoteness of some of the areas within the FSM. All four island states or LEAs reported a high percentage of returned surveys, with one of the four LEAs returning 100% of the surveys. FSM, therefore, demonstrates geographic, ethnic, and racial representation in the respondents for its FFY 2014 parent survey.

Data Collection Methods: Two of the four LEAs (Yap and Kosrae) worked closely with their Inter-Agency Advisory Council members and representatives of their parent organizations to support the dissemination and completion of the parent surveys by parents of children with and IEP at the preschool, elementary, and secondary levels. Both Yap and Kosrae trained parents in collaboration with the special education staff on the survey. As a result, Yap maintained its 100% (242/242) return rate, as in the previous year's reporting, and Kosrae's return rate was 96.60% (170/176).

The other two LEAs (Chuuk and Pohnpei) worked directly with the school principals and teachers, including the special education teachers, in the dissemination and collection of the parent surveys. In the main island of Pohnpei, parents were called to meeting sites where the surveys were administered, while in the outer islands, the surveys were distributed door-to-door of the parents' home. As a result, Chuuk's return rate was 98.72% (924/936) and Pohnpei's return rate was 87.96% (665/756).

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

The strategies used by each LEA were found to be successful, resulting in a significantly high return rate of parent surveys, which demonstrates their commitment to ensuring all parents have an opportunity to provide input by completing the surveys, including parents of children with preschoolers with IEPs.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

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

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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))

This indicator is not applicable.

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

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

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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))

This indicator is not applicable.

Indicator 11: Child Find

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		95.00%	67.00%	83.00%	89.00%	99.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
355	343	100%	100%	96.62%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	12
---	----

Explanation of Slippage

FSM reported slippage in FFY 2014 by 3.38% from 100% compliance in FFY 2013 to 96.62% (343/355) substantial compliance in FFY 2014. The reasons for the slippage were related to program noncompliance, including lack of personnel to conduct the assessment, schedules for evaluations, and tracking of the initial evaluation process, especially for the early childhood referrals. It should be noted that although late, all 12 initial evaluations were completed over timeline, as indicated in the "Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b)" section of this Indicator.

During the FSM SPP/APR Leadership Meeting, stakeholders from the National and State Special Education Programs, including the Special Education Coordinator from each FSM state, discussed how to address the timeliness of the initial evaluations. It was agreed that the FSM State Special Education Coordinators will regularly review the information on the required procedural timeline reports generated by the FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS) to determine the needs of the evaluators to complete the initial evaluations on time. The SITS reports include date of referral and date of parent consent so the Special Education Coordinators would be able to determine the deadline for the 60-day timeline. It was agreed that if any FSM State anticipates that their evaluator will not be able to meet the timeline, they need to communicate with the FSM National Chief of Special Services Division to assist with possibly having an evaluator from the nearest FSM State conduct the evaluation.

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

The range of days beyond the timeline for the 12 initial evaluations completed over timeline include:

Range of Days Over Timeline	# of Initial Evaluations
Less than 10 days	3
10 days - 20 days	4
21 days - 30 days	2
31 days - 40 days	2
42 days	1
Total Initials Over Timeline	12

The reasons for the delays related to program noncompliance, including lack of personnel to conduct the assessment, schedules for evaluations, and tracking of the initial evaluation process, especially for the early childhood referrals.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations?

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Data Source: The evaluation data were taken from the FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS) database system of all children for whom a parental consent to evaluate was received for the report year July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015. The evaluation data are collected through each FSM State/LEA inputting the completion dates into the web-based FSM SITS, based on the completed FSM IDEA procedural forms.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, **not including correction of findings**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

Indicator 12 does not apply to the FSM. FSM does not receive IDEA Part C funding.

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))

This indicator is not applicable.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

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 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						88.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
335	335	100%	100%	100%

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Data Source: The secondary transition data were taken from the completed Transition Services Record Review Summary forms of all youth with IEPs aged 16 and above for the report year July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015. These completed forms were submitted to FSM-National Department of Education (NDOE). FSM-NDOE verified the submitted data with the youth with IEPs aged 16 and above in the FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS) for the reporting year.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, **not including correction of findings**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2009	Target ≥							13.00%	14.00%	14.00%	7.00%
		Data						13.00%	17.30%	26.00%	17.00%	7.69%
B	2009	Target ≥							26.00%	27.00%	27.00%	35.00%
		Data						26.00%	28.80%	37.00%	26.00%	50.43%
C	2009	Target ≥							34.00%	35.00%	35.00%	58.00%
		Data						34.00%	42.30%	54.00%	70.00%	66.67%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	9.00%	11.00%	13.00%	14.00%	14.00%
Target B ≥	40.00%	45.00%	50.00%	55.00%	60.00%
Target C ≥	60.00%	62.00%	64.00%	68.00%	70.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	148.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	5.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	26.00
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)	11.00
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).	45.00

	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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	5.00	148.00	7.69%	9.00%	3.38%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	31.00	148.00	50.43%	40.00%	20.95%
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)	87.00	148.00	66.67%	60.00%	58.78%

Explanation of A Slippage

FSM did not meet its target for 14A by 5.62% and reported slippage by 4.31% from 7.69% in FFY 2013 to 3.38% in FFY 2014. This slippage represents a difference of four leavers from nine in FFY 2013 to five in FFY 2014.

During the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership and Coordinators Meetings, stakeholders discussed the reasons for slippage. One of the reasons discussed was the College of Micronesia Entrance Test (COMET) which all applicants are required to pass in order to be accepted into the 2-year degree college. It was further discussed that the FSM College of Micronesia Board is currently reviewing the possible barrier that the COMET is presenting for all entering college freshmen. Stakeholders discussed how each FSM state needs to work with the college to provide high school students additional supports in preparation for the COMET.

Another possible reason for the slippage is the preference for the leavers to work to help out the family instead of going to college. With limited jobs on the islands, leavers often choose to fish or grow local products to sell to assist the family. Based on the FFY 2014 survey results, close to half of all leavers surveyed or 47.97% (71/148) were competitively employed or in some other employment. In the previous reporting year, over half of all leavers surveyed or 58.97% (69/117) were competitively employed or in some other employment.

Explanation of B Slippage

FSM did not meet its target for 14B by 19.05% and reported slippage by 29.48% from 50.43% in FFY 2013 to 20.95% in FFY 2014. This slippage represents a difference of 28 leavers from 59 leavers who were in higher education or competitively employed in FFY 2013 to 31 in FFY 2014.

As explained for 14A, stakeholders discussed reasons for slippage being the possible barrier of having to pass the COMET for entrance into FSM's College of Micronesia and limited jobs on island, specifically competitive jobs, especially for those youth with IEPs who drop-out.

Explanation of C Slippage

FSM did not meet its target for 14C by 1.22% and reported slippage by 7.89% from 66.67% in FFY 2013 to 58.78% in FFY 2014. By numbers, FSM actually increased the number of leavers reported under 14C from 78 in FFY 2013 to 87 in FFY 2014.

The slippage in percentage is due to the overall number of leavers who responded to the survey. In FFY 2013, the number of leavers was 117, which represented 100% respondents, while in FFY 2014, there was a total of 148 respondents representing 96.10% (148/154) of the leavers surveyed.

As explained under 14A and 14B, reasons for slippage could be the possible barrier of having to pass the COMET for entrance into FSM's College of Micronesia and limited jobs on island, specifically competitive jobs, especially for those youth with IEPs who drop-out.

As discussed under 14A, the COMET is being reviewed by the FSM College of Micronesia Board. Stakeholders agreed that supports are needed in the high schools to support students with IEPs transition from high school to higher education, competitive employment, other training, or other employment. With limited competitive jobs on the islands, it

would be important for high schools to work with their communities and businesses to explore other opportunities for training and employment.

Was sampling used? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FSM demonstrated representation of its demographics with a 96.10% (148/154) return rate of its FFY2013 leavers responding to the post-school outcome survey in FFY 2014.

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥										
Data										

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	n	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0			

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 16: Mediation

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥										
Data										

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1 Mediations held	n	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	0			

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target ≥		14.00%
Data	12.00%	

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
 Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	17.00%	21.00%	26.00%	32.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Refer to the Introduction section on page 1 in the attached FSM SSIP Phase 1.

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Refer to SSIP Component #1 on pages 2-7 in the attached complete FSM SSIP Phase 1.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP.

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

Refer to the SSIP Component #3 on pages 8-17 in the attached complete FSM SSIP Phase 1.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

Refer to the SSIP Component #3 on pages 18-22 in the attached complete FSM SSIP Phase 1.

Description

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

[FSM SSIP Theory of Action](#) FSM SSIP Theory of Action

Illustration

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

Refer to Component #5 on page 32-34 in the attached complete FSM SSIP Phase 1.

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

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.

Selected: 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: Chief of Special Services Division

Email: aalbert@dss.edu.fm

Phone: 691-320-8982