

FM Part B

FFY2015 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

This Executive Summary includes a description of the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2015. A description of FSM's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public are provided separately within this Introduction section of FSM's FFY 2015 SPP/APR.

In FFY 2013, with input from stakeholders, FSM identified targets for FFY 2014 to FFY 2018 for the SPP Results Indicators. Targets for Results Indicators 1 to 8 and 14-16 were established, in addition to targets set at 100% for Compliance Indicators 11 and 13. As per OSEP's instructions, the following Indicators do not apply to the FSM: 3A, 4B, 9, 10, and 12.

FSM's FFY 2015 APR includes performance for the 11 Results and 2 Compliance Indicators of the 16 SPP Indicator measures that apply to FSM and explanation of slippage for required Indicators that FSM's Targets were not met. Although FSM did not meet all Results indicator targets in FFY 2015, stakeholders decided not to revise targets for the FFY 2015 to FFY 2018 APRs.

As required of Indicator 17, FSM's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), FSM will submit its FFY 2015 performance and SSIP Phase III no later than April 3, 2017.

Pursuant to FSM's 2016 Determination issued by USDOE Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on June 28, 2016, FSM is required to determine the compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance in order to improve its performance on the compliance indicators. As required, due with its FFY 2015 SPP/APR submission no later than February 1, 2017, FSM reports the following:

Technical assistance sources from which FSM received assistance:

Based on FSM's compliance matrix performance, FSM received assistance from the EdFacts Partner Support Center, IDEA Data Center (IDC), and the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) Part B Data Manager Affinity Group to improve FSM's ability to submit complete and accurate APR and 618 data. In addition, as described in the Stakeholder Involvement section of this FFY 2015 APR Introduction, FSM also accessed technical assistance from OSEP-funded National Centers, such as the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), IDEA Early Childhood Data System (DaSy), IDEA Data Center (IDC), and Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA), and other technical assistance providers, such as University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Services (CEDDERS), San Diego State University (SDSU) Interwork Institute, University of Oregon, and Sigma, Inc. (Minnesota), to provide on-site and off-site consultations for improving programs and services, including reported data for compliance and results indicators, for improving educational results for children with disabilities in the FSM.

Actions FSM took as a result of the technical assistance:

FSM actions taken as a result of the technical assistance received included refining communication protocols with personnel from its four island states for data collection, review, and reporting, which included facilitating FSM Data Managers training sessions. On-site training activities for both general and special education administrators, specialists, teachers, and parents for improving programs and services for improving educational results for children with disabilities in the FSM were also conducted during special education on-site monitoring/verifications, FSM annual Micronesian Teacher Education Conference (MTEC), Assessment Training, Early Childhood Outcome training, and SPP/APR leadership meetings.

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.

1

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

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

Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, for child-specific regulatory noncompliance, demonstration of correction is verified through a review of additional data related to the regulatory citation that demonstrates 100% compliance with the requirement and all child-specific instances of noncompliance verified 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

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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, quarterly progress reporting, and periodical leadership meetings, such as SPP/APR and SSIP meetings and NDOE Division of Basic Education and Accreditation meetings or workshops where issues affecting children with disabilities are discussed.

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

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

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

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

NDOE, FSM's conduit for accessing local, regional, and national resources, has engaged in several OSEP-funded regional professional development grants to improve the knowledge and skills of service providers working with children with disabilities. The Pacific Assessment Consortium (PAC6) served to support the development and implementation of FSM's Alternate Assessment based on Alternate Achievement Standards (AA-AAS), which included teacher training, and the Pacific Consortium for Instructional Materials Accessibility Project (Pacific CIMAP) provided technical support and training for teachers and related service personnel to ensure

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 RTI initiative or FSM's Project LIFT includes other key stakeholders, including Department specialists, schools administrators, teachers, and parents for the development and implementation of Indicator 17: FSM's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

For the development of FSM's FFY 2015 IDEA Part B APR and SSIP Phase III (Indicator 17), NDOE engaged the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership Team and other key education leaders, as follows:

- On February 2-5, 2016, NDOE convened the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team in Pohnpei 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 of performance on all targets for all states and national were reviewed and discussions held. 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.
- On March 15-18, 2016, NDOE APR Leadership meeting in Chuuk for SSIP Phase II included discussions on Indicator 17 as well as the applicable performance indicators for FSM. Meeting participants included consultants from UOG CEDDERS, University of Oregon, Sigma Associates, Inc. of Minnesota, NDOE Chief of Division of Basic Education and Accreditation, State DOE administrators, teachers, specialists (both general and special education), and parent representatives. Performance data were reviewed to determine LEA and FSM national areas needing technical assistance for improvement. The Early Literacy Monitoring (ELMO) database was also discussed to ensure it serves the needs of the LEA and FSM national for the collection of timely and accurate student performance data.
- On July 19-22, 2016, NDOE convened a meeting for Special Education Coordinators and key staffs, teachers and parent representatives during the 2016 MTEC held on Kosrae. Considerations for systemic improvement were discussed based on FSM's performances on the Indicators and other data reports reviewed.
- On August 30-September 2, 2016, NDOE convened the National SPP/APR Leadership Team, comprised of NDOE and LEA representatives, including the state-level Special Education Advisory Council members, to review FSM's 2016 Determination and to verify FSM's FFY 2015 APR indicator data and information.
- On October 17-19, 2016, Special Education representatives from both LEA and FSM national participated in a nation wide planning initiative, Global Partnership for Education-Sector Planning initiation meeting on Pohnpei. This NDOE initiative include education, finance, private sector, non-government organization, community leaders. Special Education staffs take this opportunity to share concerns and suggestions for improvements in the areas of data collection, personnel development, accessibility, parent involvement, and literacy intervention.
- On January 30-February 2, 2017, NDOE convened the National SPP/APR Leadership Team to finalize the data and information for FSM's FFY 2015 APR for final submission to OSEP. As a result of FSM's APR submission, the Team spent time reviewing the data and outlining next steps for addressing the Indicators with reported slippage or low performance.

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 2014 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 2014 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 2014 APR in 2016, 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> and

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2015 and 2016 is Needs Assistance.

In the State's 2016 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities.

The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.

The State must report, with its FFY 2015 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2017, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

Pursuant to FSM's 2016 Determination issued by USDOE Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on June 28, 2016, FSM is required to determine the compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance in order to improve its performance on the compliance indicators. As required, due with its FFY 2015 SPP/APR submission no later than February 1, 2017, FSM reports the following:

Technical assistance sources from which FSM received assistance:

Based on FSM's compliance matrix performance, FSM received assistance from the EdFacts Partner Support Center, IDEA Data Center (IDC), and the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) Part B Data Manager Affinity Group to improve FSM's ability to submit complete and accurate APR and 618 data. In addition, as described in the Stakeholder Involvement section of this FFY 2015 APR Introduction, FSM also accessed technical assistance from OSEP-funded National Centers, such as the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), IDEA Early Childhood Data System (DaSy), IDEA Data Center (IDC), and Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA), and other technical assistance providers, such as University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Services (CEDDERS), San Diego State University (SDSU) Interwork Institute, University of Oregon, and Sigma, Inc. (Minnesota), to provide on-site and off-site consultations for improving programs and services, including reported data for compliance and results indicators, for improving educational results for children with disabilities in the FSM.

Actions FSM took as a result of the technical assistance:

FSM actions taken as a result of the technical assistance received included refining communication protocols with personnel from its four island states for data collection, review, and reporting, which included facilitating FSM Data Managers training sessions. On-site training activities for both general and special education administrators, specialists, teachers, and parents for improving programs and services for improving educational results for children with disabilities in the FSM were also conducted during special education on-site monitoring/verifications, FSM annual Micronesian Teacher Education Conference (MTEC), Assessment Training, Early Childhood Outcome training, and SPP/APR leadership meetings.

OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2015 and 2016 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 28, 2016 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2015 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2017, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

Required Actions

--

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target ≥			75.00%	76.00%	76.00%	77.00%	79.00%	81.00%	82.00%	56.00%	62.00%
Data		83.00%	87.00%	81.00%	81.00%	95.00%	77.00%	90.00%	82.00%	56.94%	93.22%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY 2013, 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 August 2016 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. In January 2017, the National SPP/APR Leadership Team members reviewed the historical, baseline, and performance data presented in GRADS 360.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
			null	42
			null	61
				Calculate <input checked="" 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 2014-2015 data to report in this FFY 2015 APR for Indicator 1. In 2014-2015, there was a total of 61 enrolled seniors with an IEP; of which, 42 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.

Explanation of Data Discrepancy

Please explain why the calculated total does not match the adjusted cohort graduation rate reported to the CSPR.

As one of the Freely Associated States (FAS), FSM does not report graduation data to the Department under Title 1 of the ESEA.

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data	FFY 2015 Target	FFY 2015 Data
42	61	93.22%	67.00%	68.85%

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target ≤			3.00%	2.50%	2.50%	2.00%	1.00%	0%	2.00%	10.00%	9.00%
Data		1.00%	4.00%	3.00%	3.00%	7.70%	2.50%	3.00%	8.00%	9.91%	22.69%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY 2013, 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 August 2016 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. In the January 2017 National meeting, the National SPP/APR Leadership team members reviewed the historical data, baseline, and performance data presented in GRADS 360 to ensure compliance with reporting requirements.

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
62	305	22.69%	7.00%	20.33%

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 2014-2015 high school drop-out and enrollment data to determine FSM's data for this FFY 2015 APR for Indicator 2.

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

In 2014-2015, the total number of youth with IEPs in high school was 305; of which, 62 were youth with IEPs who dropped out from high school. For Indicator 2, 62 was the number used as the numerator representing youth with IEPs who dropped out of high school, which is different from the 93 reported in the 618 data. Through data verification during the FSM National Leadership meeting in January 2017, 31 students with an IEP who dropped out were still in elementary schools during this reporting period.

Although FSM did not meet its target of 7% in FFY 2015, FSM's performance decreased from 22.69% (98/432) reported in FFY 2014 to 20.33% (62/305) reported in FFY 2015, representing a decrease of 36 youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup**

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

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data											

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥				

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP?

Yes No

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AYP	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1	null	null			

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			65.00%	70.00%	80.00%	90.00%	100%	100%	100%	54.00%	100%
			Data		41.00%	55.00%	66.00%	41.30%	56.50%	89.40%	59.00%	31.00%	54.56%	50.09%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			65.00%	70.00%			100%	100%	100%	55.00%	100%
			Data		39.00%	56.00%	55.00%			71.00%	62.00%	34.00%	55.28%	54.09%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY 2013, 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 August 2016 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 January 2017 National meeting, members reviewed the historical, baseline, and FFY 2015 performance data presented in GRADS 360. With consideration for the overall FSM National priority to have all students participate in the FSM state-wide assessment, members agreed to maintain the 100% target for Indicator 3B in subsequent years.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Overall	496	286	50.09%	100%	57.66%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Overall	660	368	54.09%	100%	55.76%

Public Reporting Information

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			8.00%	9.00%	12.00%	4.00%	5.00%	12.00%	12.00%	2.00%	4.00%
			Data		7.00%	8.00%	3.00%	1.20%	4.60%	3.40%	1.80%	0%	2.84%	3.31%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			4.00%	5.00%			5.00%	8.00%	8.00%	2.00%	4.00%
			Data		3.00%	0%	4.00%			2.00%	1.00%	0.90%	0%	2.05%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY 2013, 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 August 2016 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 January 2017 APR Leadership meeting, members reviewed the historical data, baseline, and FFY 2015 performance data presented in GRADS 360. Members recommended to maintain the targets set for Indicator 3C which represent realistic expectations given FSM's current infrastructure. Project Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow (Project LIFT), which is a FSM literacy intervention initiative using Response to Intervention (RTI) instructional methods, is being implemented and reviewed to assess its impact on the overall performance of students. The APR Leadership team will continue to monitor Indicator 3 outcomes in relation to Project LIFT outcomes, and if needed, targets will be changed.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Overall	286	12	3.31%	6.00%	4.20%

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Overall	368	4	2.05%	6.00%	1.09%

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Explanation of Group A Slippage

FSM did not meet its FFY 2015 target of 6% for Math Assessment and reported slippage by 0.96% from 2.05% (8/390) in FFY 2014 to 1.09% (4/368) in FFY 2015. By numbers, the reported slippage represents four less students from eight in FFY 2014 to four in FFY 2015.

FSM APR Leadership team identified the following factors that contributed to Indicator 3C Math slippage of performance:

The FSM National Minimum Competency Test (NMCT) requires annual training to proctors on the administration of the test and accommodations needed by students with IEPs. The APR Leadership team acknowledged that in some schools, the proctors were not fully trained, which could have been a factor with the consistency in accommodations provided based on each student's IEP.

Another factor that may have contributed to Indicator 3C slippage is with the delay of reporting of NMCT results by NDOE back to FSM states for instructional planning and implementation. NMCT is administered annually between March and April and test results were made available to states around November of the new school year.

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 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target ≤			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY 2013, 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 August 2016 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. In January 2017, the National SPP/APR Leadership Team members reviewed the historical, baseline, and performance data presented in GRADS 360.

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	1	0%	0%	0%

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 LEAs rate and then analyzing the rates to determine if any LEAs 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

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

will be conducted because FSM has been reporting in previous years "0" suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for children with disabilities.

In 2014-2015, 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 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2014 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2015 using 2014-2015 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 2014

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

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target											
Data											0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target				

FFY 2015 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, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
null	null	1	0%		0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2014 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2015 using 2014-2015 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).

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02,

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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

OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable to FSM.

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			97.00%	97.25%	97.75%	97.70%	98.00%	97.10%	97.10%	91.75%	92.00%
		Data		93.00%	90.00%	84.00%	84.00%	91.00%	95.00%	94.00%	94.20%	95.31%	94.04%
B	2005	Target ≤			0.25%	0.25%	0.25%	0.25%	0.25%	0.25%	0.25%	2.70%	2.20%
		Data		0%	3.00%	7.00%	6.00%	2.80%	2.00%	2.50%	1.70%	0.99%	0.78%
C	2005	Target ≤			2.50%	2.25%	1.75%	1.70%	1.50%	1.00%	1.00%	3.00%	3.00%
		Data		7.00%	6.00%	7.00%	8.00%	6.00%	3.00%	3.60%	3.80%	2.87%	4.10%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY 2013, 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 August 2016 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 January 2017 National meeting, members reviewed the historical, baseline, and FFY 2015 performance data presented in GRADS 360. As discussed in previous APRs, 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 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	1,914	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	1,807	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	12	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	n	null

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	58	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	1,807	1,914	94.04%	92.50%	94.41%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6	1,914	0.78%	1.70%	0.31%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	70	1,914	4.10%	3.00%	3.66%

Use a different calculation methodology
 Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									88.70%	75.00%	75.00%
		Data								88.50%	80.30%	75.98%	67.67%
B	2011	Target ≤									0.60%	0.70%	0.70%
		Data								0.70%	0%	0%	2.26%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY 2013, 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 August 2016 National SPP/APR Leadership Team meeting, the team reviewed FSM trend data and US National trend data related to Preschool LRE rates. During the January 2017 National meeting, members reviewed the historical, baseline, and FFY 2015 performance presented in GRADS 360. As discussed in previous APRs, 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 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	133	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	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
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	n	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b2. Number of children attending separate school	n	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
--	---	---	----------------	------------------	---------------

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 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	67.67%	80.00%	67.67%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	3	133	2.26%	0.70%	2.26%

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

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						79.50%	79.70%	79.70%	79.70%	83.00%	83.00%
		Data					79.50%	80.30%	89.40%	88.00%	90.20%	83.82%	87.00%
A2	2008	Target ≥						65.00%	66.00%	66.00%	66.00%	71.00%	71.00%
		Data					65.00%	48.20%	76.40%	66.00%	68.00%	71.62%	59.05%
B1	2008	Target ≥						80.00%	80.10%	80.10%	80.10%	78.00%	78.25%
		Data					80.00%	81.40%	86.20%	89.00%	89.00%	78.57%	87.13%
B2	2008	Target ≥						65.00%	66.00%	66.00%	66.00%	62.00%	62.00%
		Data					65.00%	45.80%	76.40%	62.00%	60.00%	62.16%	48.57%
C1	2008	Target ≥						87.00%	88.00%	88.00%	88.00%	85.00%	85.00%
		Data					87.00%	81.40%	84.20%	90.00%	92.00%	85.00%	85.86%
C2	2008	Target ≥						68.30%	68.40%	68.40%	68.40%	75.00%	75.00%
		Data					68.30%	53.00%	83.30%	65.00%	70.80%	75.68%	54.29%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY 2013, 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 August 2016 and January 2017 National meetings, members reviewed the FSM trend data and US National trend data related to early childhood outcomes. The team reviewed the historical, baseline, and FFY 2015 performance data presented in GRADS 360. The team also provided input to the 7A slippage explanation.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	82.00
--	-------

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

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of Children	Percentage 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	15.85%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	24.00	29.27%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	30.00	36.59%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	15.00	18.29%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	54.00	67.00	87.00%	83.00%	80.60%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	45.00	82.00	59.05%	71.00%	54.88%

Explanation of A1 Slippage

A total of 82 children with IEPs were administered both Entry and Exit test using the FSM Inventory of Development (FSM ID) in school year 2015-2016. NDOE continues to provide technical support and trainings to the LEAs on the use of FSM ID to include the most recent training in July 2016 for both general and special education early childhood education teachers. The FSM ID procedures were also updated to include specific instructions to ensure that the evaluation tool is administered with fidelity producing valid and reliable data. Notwithstanding, the trained staffs were not consistently utilized to administer FSM ID and compile and analyze data to inform instructions as may be needed to improve student performances in the early childhood education programs. This might have been a factor for the slippage demonstrated for 7A1 and 7A2 specific to positive social-emotional skills.

With enrollment data for early childhood education programs in the four FSM states, the number of students with and without disabilities, the teacher/student ratio for early childhood education shows a great need for teachers. This may have been the result of laying-off of teachers due to the FSM teacher certification law, job change due to low salary. In fact, only 4 teachers are utilized in the whole Chuuk ECE Centers. Personnel shortage could have also been a factor for the slippage in 7A1 and 7A2.

Explanation of A2 Slippage

A total of 82 children with IEPs were administered both Entry and Exit test using the FSM Inventory of Development (FSM ID) in school year 2015-2016. NDOE continues to provide technical support and trainings to the LEAs on the use of FSM ID to include the most recent training in July 2016 for both general and special education early childhood education teachers. The FSM ID procedures were also updated to include specific instructions to ensure that the evaluation tool is administered with fidelity producing valid and reliable data. Notwithstanding, the trained staffs were not consistently utilized to administer FSM ID and compile and analyze data to inform instructions as may be needed to improve student performances in the early childhood education programs. This might have been a factor for the slippage demonstrated for 7A1 and 7A2 specific to positive social-emotional skills.

With enrollment data for early childhood education programs in the four FSM states, the number of students with and without disabilities, the teacher/student ratio for early childhood education shows a great need for teachers. This may have been the result of laying-off of teachers due to the FSM teacher certification law, job change due to low salary. In fact, only 4 teachers are utilized in the whole Chuuk ECE Centers. Personnel shortage could have also been a factor for the slippage in 7A1 and 7A2.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0.00	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	11.00	13.41%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	29.00	35.37%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	36.00	43.90%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	6.00	7.32%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	65.00	76.00	87.13%	78.25%	85.53%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	42.00	82.00	48.57%	63.00%	51.22%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0.00	

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	9.00	10.98%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	24.00	29.27%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	34.00	41.46%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	15.00	18.29%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 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)	58.00	67.00	85.86%	86.00%	86.57%
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)	49.00	82.00	54.29%	75.00%	59.76%

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 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target ≥			45.00%	60.00%	75.00%	90.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	59.00%	60.00%
Data		39.00%	82.00%	83.00%	85.00%	88.00%	65.00%	56.00%	63.00%	59.19%	58.58%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY 2013, 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 August 2016 and January 2017 National meetings, members reviewed the FSM trend data and US National trend data related to parent involvement survey results, and discussed OSEP's requirement to report valid and reliable Indicator 8 data in FFY 2015. With stakeholder input, in FFY 2015, FSM utilized the same parent survey as in previous years to gather parent involvement data and reported valid and reliable data using the result of one of the parent survey item responses for Indicator 8. In addition, with stakeholder input, FSM will not change targets at this time.

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1187.00	2004.00	58.58%	61.00%	59.23%

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 2015 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 2015 response rate of 97.19% (2004/2062) represents an increase by 2.36% from 94.83% (2001/2110) in FFY 2014; an increase of three 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 two of the four LEAs returning 100% of the surveys. FSM, therefore, demonstrates geographic, ethnic, and racial representation in the respondents for its FFY 2015 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, both Yap and Kosrae reported a 100% return rate with Yap receiving all 217 disseminated surveys and Kosrae receiving all 183 surveys disseminated.

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

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 96.26% (874/908) and Pohnpei's return rate was 96.81% (730/754).

In all four 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 language 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 demonstrate their commitment to ensuring all parents have an opportunity to provide input by completing the surveys, including parents of children with preschoolers with IEPs.

Data Calculation Method: OSEP required FSM to report valid and reliable data in FFY 2015 for Indicator 8. In previous years, FSM utilized the cumulative responses from all six questions in the "FSM Parent Survey" to calculate its annual performance. In FFY 2015, FSM disseminated the same parent survey but utilized the results from one of the survey items to report FSM's Indicator 8 performance.

There are a total of six questions in the "FSM Parent Survey" related to parent involvement in their child's education as a means of improving the services and results for children with disabilities. The six survey items request parents to choose one of three response categories: 1) satisfied/understood/included; 2) somewhat/ sometimes; and 3) not enough or never. Survey Item #1 asks the following: *Have you been included as a full partner in making decisions about your child's special education program?*

A response of "included" or the first response category for Survey Item #1 was used as the numerator to determine the percentage of parent respondents who reported that school facilitated parental involvement. Of the 2004 total parent surveys returned, 1187 parent respondents indicated that they were "included" as a full partner in making decisions about their child's special education program. This resulted in FSM's 59.23% (1187/2004) performance for Indicator 8.

Table 1 shows the breakdown of "included" survey responses for survey Item #1 for each LEA and overall FSM:

Table 1: Parent Response of "Included" Survey Item #1 for Indicator 8 Calculation

FSM State/LEA	# of Surveys Returned	# of "Included" Response for Item #1	% of Parent Respondents for Indicator 8 Performance
Chuuk	874	540	61.78% (540/874)
Kosrae	183	110	60.11% (110/183)
Pohnpei	730	373	51.10% (373/730)
Yap	217	164	75.58% (164/217)
Overall FSM Performance	2004	1187	59.23% (1187/2004)

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State

No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2014. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2015 in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

FSM reports valid and reliable data for its FFY 2015 Indicator 8 performance. FSM describes its FFY 2015 data collection and calculation methods in the FFY 2015 Data tab for Indicator 8.

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data											

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2015 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 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
null	null	1		0%	

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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

OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable to FSM.

--

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data											

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2015 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 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
null	null	1		0%	

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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

OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable to FSM.

--

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		95.00%	67.00%	83.00%	89.00%	99.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96.62%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
322	319	96.62%	100%	99.07%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	3
---	---

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 number of days beyond the timeline for all three initial evaluations was 17 days over the 60-day timeline requirement. The reason for the delay was due to scheduling travel to the outer island where the three children reside.

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, 2015 to June 30, 2016. 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 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
12	12	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2014, FSM reported 96.62% (343/355) compliance for Indicator 11, which represented 12 initial evaluations over timeline. As reported in FFY 2014, all 12 initial evaluations over timeline were completed 42 days or less over the 60-day timeline. In FFY 2014, FSM National Department of Education, Special Education Program or the SEA issued written notices of findings of noncompliance to three FSM State Departments of Education or LEAs for the 12 individual instances of initial evaluations completed over the timeline: Chuuk, Kosrae, and Pohnpei.

Consistent with FSM's monitoring procedures, the SEA verified timely correction of each LEA's noncompliance related to the initial evaluation timeline requirement through a review of Indicator 11 data in the FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS) on a quarterly basis. All three LEAs were able to demonstrate that the reported individual instances over timeline were completed and subsequent quarterly data of initial evaluations were 100% completed within the 60-day timeline requirement. The quarterly data reviews serve as the source of data to demonstrate that each LEA was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

For Indicator 11, timely initial evaluation, FSM verifies that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected through their quarterly off-site monitoring of the data in the FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS). The FSM SITS serves as the FSM Special Education data system for reporting, including timeline requirements, such as initial evaluations.

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data											

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	null
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	null
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	null
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	null
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	null

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
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. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	null	null		100%	

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	0
--	---

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.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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

OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable to FSM.

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						88.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
368	368	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, 2015 to June 30, 2016. 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 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							13.00%	14.00%	14.00%	7.00%	9.00%
		Data						13.00%	17.30%	26.00%	17.00%	7.69%	3.38%
B	2009	Target ≥							26.00%	27.00%	27.00%	35.00%	40.00%
		Data						26.00%	28.80%	37.00%	26.00%	50.43%	20.95%
C	2009	Target ≥							34.00%	35.00%	35.00%	58.00%	60.00%
		Data						34.00%	42.30%	54.00%	70.00%	66.67%	58.78%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY 2013, 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 August 2016 National SPP/APR Leadership Team meeting, the team reviewed FSM trend data and US National trend data related to post-school outcomes. In January 2017, the National SPP/APR Leadership Team members reviewed the historical, baseline, and performance data presented in GRADS 360.

FFY 2015 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	106.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	11.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	32.00
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)	3.00
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).	50.00

	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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	11.00	106.00	3.38%	11.00%	10.38%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	43.00	106.00	20.95%	45.00%	40.57%
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)	96.00	106.00	58.78%	62.00%	90.57%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FSM demonstrated representation of its demographics with a 100% (106/106) return rate of its FFY2014 high school leavers responding to the post-school outcome survey in FFY 2015. The 106 leaver respondents represented 42 youth with IEPs who graduated, 62 youth with IEPs who dropped out, and two youth with IEPs who aged-out. In FFY 2014, there was a total of 137 reported 618 data for exiters. The difference in the total number of 618 exiters and the total number of leavers surveyed was in the the drop-out category. As discussed for Indicator 2, there were 93 reported 618 exiters who dropped out which accounted for 62 in the high schools and 31 from elementary schools. Therefore, for Indicator 2 and Indicator 14, the reported total number of youth with IEPs who dropped out of high school was 62.

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.

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 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target ≥											
Data											

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	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 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0			

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2015. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target ≥											
Data											

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	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 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1 Mediations held	n	null

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	0			

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2015. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) 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	2015
Target ≥		14.00%	17.00%
Data	12.00%	28.00%	25.00%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Description of Measure

FSM will be measuring early literacy skills of all students in ECE through grade 5 in four pilot schools. Refer to SSIP Component #3: SIMR on pages 18-22 in the attached FSM SSIP Phase 1 for a complete description of the measurements.

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. 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).

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

Refer to SSIP Component #4 on pages 23-31 in the attached complete FSM SSIP Phase 1.

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.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

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.

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Refer to Component #1: Infrastructure Development in the attached FSM SSIP Phase II.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Refer to Component #2: Implementation of EBPs in the attached FSM SSIP Phase II.

Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Refer to Component #3: Evaluation in the attached FSM SSIP Phase II.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The development of FSM's SSIP Phase II was made possible with support and technical assistance from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) and OSEP-funded National Technical Assistance (TA) Centers, such as the IDEA Data Center (IDC), Center for Early Childhood Data System (DaSy), Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) Center, and the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI). FSM participated in the NCSI Language & Literacy Cross-Entity Learning Collaborative meeting and the Pacific Entity Collaborative meeting. FSM also accessed numerous resources available on the TA centers websites, face-to-face meetings, conference calls and facilitated work sessions. In addition, FSM received technical assistance from University of Oregon, San Diego State University, University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, & Services, and Sigma Associates (of University of Minnesota) for the development of Phase II.

FSM will continue to access and request TA in the areas needed to ensure the improvement activities are effective and will lead to improvement in the SIMR.

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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: Chief State School Officer

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: Director

Email: aalbert@dss.edu.fm

Phone: 691-320-8982