

# FM Part B

# FFY2016 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

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 2016. 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 2016 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 2016 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 2016, stakeholders decided not to revise targets for the FFY 2016 to FFY 2018 APRs.

As per OSEP's instructions, for Indicator 17, FSM's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), FSM will submit its FFY 2016 performance and SSIP Phase III, Year Two, no later than April 2, 2018.

FSM's 2017 Determination issued by USDOE OSEP on June 28, 2017 stated that FSM met the requirements and purposes of IDEA Part B. The Determination further reminded FSM to review previous year's OSEP Response to each indicator and any actions that FSM may be required to take. FSM has reviewed its previous year's SPP/APR submission, and if required, has provided its actions or responses in the relevant indicators of this FFY 2016 APR.

#### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

1

#### General Supervision System:

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

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

FSM's administrative structure for the implementation of IDEA Part B requirements includes the NDOE as the SEA and the four FSM islands states as the LEAs. NDOE has three organizational divisions, Division of 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 monitoring involves review and verification of correction of non-compliance and continuing adherence to the requirements from the authorities listed above. In addition, FSM's dispute resolution system data, in particular, complaint and due process hearing requests, are reviewed for the identification of noncompliance findings.

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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

instances of noncompliance verified as corrected. For system noncompliance, evidence of correction of noncompliance includes documentation of revised LEA policies or procedures and/or practices and evidence that such required/recommended policies or procedures and/or practices to be developed, implemented, or revised are in fact implemented. An LEA showing documents or data reports noting correction of noncompliance that are verified will be determined to have corrected noncompliance issued to that respective LEA.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Technical Assistance System:**

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

Given FSM's unique geographic context, NDOE has in place a mechanism to ensure timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to each island state/LEA. NDOE implements a reporting mechanism to identify and prioritize technical assistance and training needs in each LEA through the annual LEA application for IDEA Part B funding, quarterly progress reporting, and periodical leadership meetings, such as SPP/APR and SSIP meetings and NDOE Division of Basic Education and Accreditation meetings or workshops where issues affecting children with disabilities are discussed.

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

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

**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 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

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Response to Intervention (RTI) Initiative, Project LIFT has identified pilot schools to develop and implement the RTI framework within their SIP. Project LIFT purposefully plans for teacher and support personnel training, coaching, and resource supports in the pilot schools for student screening and assessment, student progress monitoring, and research based instructional intervention programs for improving literacy skills for children in early childhood education through fifth grade.

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

### 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 2016 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 March 6-10, 2017, FSM National and State Leadership teams met in Yap to finalize the FFY 2015 SSIP Phase III Year 1 for submission to OSEP on April 3, 2017. The meeting also included discussions on SPP and LPP related progresses and prioritization of areas requiring technical assistance for LEAs. Other stakeholders that attended this leadership meeting were general education teachers, specialists, and school administrators, and parents.
- On July 3-7, 2017, NDOE conducted the first Project LIFT Reading symposium on Yap state. The symposium was intended for certification of trainers on the core reading programs used in the project. During this symposium, a Parent Evening was held where parents of children attending the Yap Project LIFT pilot school and other school community parents were invited and participated in learning games with their kids. This opportunity allowed the parents and school community folks attending the event to learn more about Project LIFT and Special Education services in general.
- On July 31-August 3, 2017, the FSM Interagency conference was held in Chuuk and National and State administrators, general and special education teachers and administrators attending the conference met and discussed SPP and LPP implementation status, challenges, and preparation for the first FFY 2016 SPP/APR Leadership meeting. FSM National and State Department of Health representatives and non-government agencies such as Chuuk Women Organization, Chuuk Conservation Society, and Hawaii and Pacific Islands Parent Training and Information Center representatives from all four LEAs, were provided a Special Education program update and an opportunity to plan on improving each LEA's Interagency services for children with disabilities and their parents.
- On September 5-8, 2017, NDOE convened the first FFY 2016 FSM National SPP/APR Leadership meeting in Pohnpei. In attendance to assist in the effort to improve academic and functional outcomes for children with disabilities, were general and special education administrators (FSM State Directors of Education), specialists and teachers. LEA Advisory Council representatives also attended this SPP/APR meeting.
- On January 23-26, 2018, the FSM National SPP/APR Leadership team convened in Kosrae for final considerations for FSM's FFY 2016 APR, including explanation of slippage for FSM's FFY 2016 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.

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### 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 2015 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 2015 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 2015 APR in 2017, 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 <http://www.fsmed.fm>

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

**FFY 2016 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 Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school 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%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	67.00%
Data	68.85%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	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	48
			null	65
				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 2015-2016 data to report in this FFY 2016 APR for Indicator 1. In 2015-2016, there was a total of 65 enrolled seniors with an IEP; of which, 48 seniors with an IEP graduated with a high school diploma. The total number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular high school diploma is consistent with the 618 reported exit data.

**FFY 2016 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 2015 Data	FFY 2016 Target	FFY 2016 Data
48	65	68.85%	72.00%	73.85%

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR

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

**Graduation 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 from 22 credits to 25 credits. However, Chuuk State continues to use the 22 credits for graduating with a high school diploma while developing its procedures for the approved 25 credit accrual requirement.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? No

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 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%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	7.00%
Data	20.33%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	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.

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- Option 1
- Option 2

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

**FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
22	532	20.33%	5.00%	4.14%

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.



## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 2015-2016 high school drop-out and enrollment data to determine FSM's data for this FFY 2016 APR Indicator 2.

In 2015-2016, the total number of youth with IEPs in high school was 532; of which, 22 were youth with IEPs who dropped out from high school. For Indicator 2, 22 was the number used as the numerator representing youth with IEPs who dropped out of high school, consistent with the 618 exit data. The total number of youth with IEPs enrolled in high school was 532, which was used as the denominator.

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

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

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

- Chuuk State: 15 cumulative unexcused absences in the school year.
- Kosrae State: 8 cumulative unexcused absences in the school year.
- Pohnpei State: 25 cumulative unexcused absences in the school year.
- Yap State: 20 consecutive unexcused absences in the school year.

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs?** No

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 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. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**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%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	100%
		Data	57.66%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	100%
		Data	55.76%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	100%	100%	100%
Math	A ≥ Overall	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 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	505	286	57.66%	100%	56.63%

**Reasons for Group A Slippage**

FSM reported a slight slippage in reading participation performance by 1.03% from 57.66% (286/496) in FFY 2015 to 56.63% (286/505) in FFY 2016. The slippage represented no change in the number of students with an IEP in the tested grades who took the test. Both

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

years reported 286 students with an IEP. The change was in the total number of enrolled students with an IEP in the tested grades from 496 in FFY 2015 to 505 in FFY 2016 for an increase of nine students with an IEP in the tested grades.

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	638	379	55.76%	100%	59.40%

**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 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 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. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**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%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	6.00%
		Data	4.20%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	6.00%
		Data	1.09%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	8.00%	10.00%	10.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	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 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	286	3	4.20%	8.00%	1.05%

**Reasons for Group A Slippage**

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

FSM reported slippage in reading proficiency by 3.15% from 4.20% (12/286) in FFY 2015 to 1.05% (3/286) in FFY 2016. The slippage represented a decrease in numbers by nine from FFY 2015 to FFY 2016.

The reason for the slippage could be attributed to the level of reading interventions being implemented in the schools. Teacher training opportunities need to focus on evidence-based reading instruction and intervention to improve student reading performance. FSM's low trend data for reading proficiency for students with an IEP was the reason Project LIFT (Literacy Intervention for FSM Leaders of Tomorrow) was developed and implemented. Project LIFT is FSM's SSIP, Indicator 17, which focuses on improving reading achievement. Because teacher training and support will impact improved student performance, full implementation of Project LIFT will provide an understanding of the system implications for infrastructure development to scale up to other schools. FSM anticipates reviewing 6th grade student performance data on the NMCT, FSM's state-wide assessment, from the pilot schools in a couple years with the full implementation of the evidence-based reading instruction and intervention.

### FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	379	4	1.09%	8.00%	1.06%

### 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 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 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%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	0%
Data	0%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%	0%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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 LEA's rate and then analyzing the rates to determine if any LEA's rate is 2% more than the lowest LEA rate. A review of the data from year to year will provide additional information for revising, if needed, FSM's "significant discrepancy" definition. This annual review will be conducted because FSM has been reporting in previous years "0" suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for children with

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

disabilities.

In 2015-2016, FSM reported "0" long-term suspension/expulsion greater than 10 days in its 618 Discipline data report, consistent with previous reporting years.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table 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 Identification of Noncompliance**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 data)

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

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

The State 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 2015**

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	null	null	0

**FFY 2016 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%

FFY	2015
Target	
Data	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target			

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
null	null	null	0%		

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

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

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table 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 Identification of Noncompliance**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 data)

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

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



**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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 2015**

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

**FFY 2016 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%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	92.50%
	Data	94.41%
B	Target ≤	1.70%
	Data	0.31%
C	Target ≤	3.00%
	Data	3.66%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	92.75%	93.00%	93.50%
Target B ≤	1.20%	1.00%	0%
Target C ≤	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 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</a>	1,901	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</a>	1,806	null

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</a>	6	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</a>	10	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</a>	n	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</a>	64	null

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	1,806	1,901	94.41%	92.75%	95.00%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6	1,901	0.31%	1.20%	0.32%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	74	1,901	3.66%	3.00%	3.89%

### Reasons for C Slippage

Based on the small percentage threshold, FSM demonstrated slippage by 0.23% from 3.66% (70/1914) in FFY 2015 to 3.89% (74/1901) in FFY 2016. This slippage represents an increase of four students with an IEP reported under 5C from the previous year, but also represents a decrease of 13 students with an IEP in the overall total number of students with IEP age 6-21 from the previous year.

It is understood that the determination of where students receive their special education and related services is an individualized decision based on the IEP Team. The reason for the slippage or the increase of four students with an IEP under 5C therefore was due to the IEP Team determining that based on their special education and related services needs, these students would be best served in their home. The Special Education Program staff are working with the home and school to transition the students back to their LRE within their school environment.

It should be noted that FSM's performance of 3.89% in FFY 2016 is slightly above the national data of 2.91% in FFY 2015 for Indicator 5C based on OSEP's 2017 SPP/APR Indicator Analyses Book.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 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 with IEPs aged 3 through 5 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%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	80.00%
	Data	67.67%
B	Target ≤	0.70%
	Data	2.26%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	85.00%	88.00%	90.00%
Target B ≤	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 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</a>	142	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">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</a>	117	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</a>	n	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">b2. Number of children attending separate school</a>	n	null

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">b3. Number of children attending residential facility</a>	n	null

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	117	142	67.67%	85.00%	82.39%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	0	142	2.26%	0.70%	0%

Use a different calculation methodology

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 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%

	FFY	2015
A1	Target ≥	83.00%
	Data	80.60%
A2	Target ≥	71.00%
	Data	54.88%
B1	Target ≥	78.25%
	Data	85.53%
B2	Target ≥	63.00%
	Data	51.22%
C1	Target ≥	86.00%
	Data	86.57%
C2	Target ≥	75.00%
	Data	59.76%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
 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 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	80.00
--	-------

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

	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	7.00	8.75%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	10.00	12.50%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	52.00	65.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	11.00	13.75%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	62.00	69.00	80.60%	85.00%	89.86%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	63.00	80.00	54.88%	71.00%	78.75%

**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	6.00	7.50%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	22.00	27.50%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	48.00	60.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	4.00	5.00%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	70.00	76.00	85.53%	78.50%	92.11%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	52.00	80.00	51.22%	64.00%	65.00%

**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	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	6.00	7.50%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	19.00	23.75%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	48.00	60.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	7.00	8.75%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
--	-----------	-------------	----------------	------------------	---------------

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	67.00	73.00	86.57%	86.00%	91.78%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	55.00	80.00	59.76%	75.00%	68.75%

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? Yes

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? Yes

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

FSM continues to use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center's Child Outcomes Summary (COS) to report on a child's progress in the three outcome measures. A child who rates 6 or 7 is considered to be developing at age "comparable to age peers." The child's IEP Team, including the parent, Related Service Assistants (RSAs), and teachers, complete the COS. FSM uses multiple sources of information to assist the IEP Team in completing the COS, such as the FSM Inventory of Development (FSM-ID), parent interview, medical reports, evaluation reports, and teacher observations. The Special Education Coordinator from each FSM State/LEA, with assistance of the FSM 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 2015 response

none



**FFY 2016 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%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	61.00%
Data	59.23%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	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 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
1318.00	1953.00	59.23%	62.00%	67.49%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	95.92%	2036.00
---	--------	---------

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

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 2016 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.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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

FSM's FFY 2016 response rate of 95.92% (1953/2036) represents a slight decrease by 1.27% from 97.19% (2004/2062) in FFY 2015. The overall number of respondents however is still significant given the geographic remoteness of some of the areas within the FSM. All four island states or LEAs reported a high percentage of returned surveys, with one LEA returning 100% of the surveys. FSM, therefore, demonstrates geographic, ethnic, and racial representation in respondents for its FFY 2016 parent survey.

**Data Collection Methods:** As in the previous year, Yap State continued to work closely with their Inter-Agency Council members and representatives of their parent organizations to support the dissemination and completion of the parent surveys by parents of children with an IEP at the preschool, elementary, and secondary levels. This resulted in a 99.42% (171/172) survey return rate for Yap State.

In Kosrae State, the Inter-Agency Council members and Special Education Program staff disseminated and collected the parent surveys. As needed, they assisted parents in completing the parent survey. This resulted in a 100% (192/192) survey return rate for Kosrae State.

Chuuk State worked directly with the school principals and teachers, including the special education teachers, in the dissemination and collection of the parent surveys. The Special Education Case Managers collected the completed parent surveys from the schools. Chuuk State reported a 94.39% (841/891) survey return rate.

Pohnpei State worked with their Special Education Advisory Council and National Special Education Office to disseminate and collect the parent surveys from the schools, resulting in a 95.90% (749/781) return rate.

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 FSM's 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:** In FFY 2016, FSM disseminated the same parent survey and utilized the results from one of the survey items to report FSM's Indicator 8 performance, as was done in FFY 2015.

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" in the first response category for Survey Item #1 was used as the numerator to determine the percentage of parent respondents who reported that school facilitated parental involvement. Of the 1953 total parent surveys returned, 1318 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 67.49% (1318/1953) 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	841	650	77.29% (650/841)
Kosrae	192	133	69.27% (133/192)
Pohnpei	749	403	53.81% (403/749)
Yap	171	132	77.19% (132/171)
<b>Overall FSM Performance</b>	<b>1953</b>	<b>1318</b>	<b>67.49% (1318/1953)</b>

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? Yes

Submitted survey: No Collection Tool Submitted

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

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 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											

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
null	null	null		0%	

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?  Yes  No

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

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table 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 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

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

**FFY 2016 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											

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
null	null	null		0%	

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?  Yes  No

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

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

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table 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 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

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

**FFY 2016 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%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	99.07%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
339	339	99.07%	100%	100%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	0
---	---

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

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

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

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

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

- State 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, 2016 to June 30, 2017. The evaluation data are collected

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table 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 2015**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

**FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

In FFY 2015, FSM reported 99.07% (319/322) compliance for Indicator 11, which represented three initial evaluations over timeline. As reported in FFY 2015, all three initial evaluations over timeline were completed 17 days over the 60-day timeline. The FSM National Department of Education, Special Education Program or the SEA issued a written notice of findings of noncompliance to one FSM State Department of Education or LEA for the three individual instances of initial evaluations completed over the 60-day timeline.

Consistent with FSM's monitoring procedures, the SEA verified timely correction of the 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. The LEA that was issued the findings of noncompliance was able to demonstrate that the reported individual instances over the 60-day timeline were completed and subsequent quarterly data of initial evaluations were 100% completed within the 60-day timeline requirement. The quarterly data reviews and FSM SITS serve as the sources 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*

FSM National Department of Education verifies that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected through the quarterly off-site monitoring of the data in the FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS) and the LEA Quarterly Progress Reports. The FSM SITS serves as the FSM Special Education data system for reporting and tracking of individual student records, ensuring that the process and timeline requirements, such as the 60-day timeline are adhered to at all LEAs for all students with disabilities who were evaluated, placed, and provided with special education and related services.



**FFY 2016 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											

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 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 their third birthdays.	null
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	null
d. Number of children 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 determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	null
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	null

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	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, or f	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 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table 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 2015**

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

**FFY 2016 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%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
401	401	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, 2016 to June 30, 2017. 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.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

- Yes
- No

Did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?  Yes  No

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table 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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

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	null	null	0

**FFY 2016 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%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	11.00%
	Data	10.38%
B	Target ≥	45.00%
	Data	40.57%
C	Target ≥	62.00%
	Data	90.57%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	13.00%	14.00%	14.00%
Target B ≥	50.00%	55.00%	60.00%
Target C ≥	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 2016 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	72.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	16.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	13.00
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)	7.00
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).	24.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
--	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------	------------------	---------------

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

		who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school			
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	16.00	72.00	10.38%	13.00%	22.22%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	29.00	72.00	40.57%	50.00%	40.28%
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)	60.00	72.00	90.57%	64.00%	83.33%

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

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

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

**Was sampling used?** No

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

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

With a response rate of 100% (72/72), FSM's FFY 2016 Indicator 14 response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

FSM's 618 exit data for 2015-2016 reported a total of 74 exiters: 48 graduated with a high school diploma, 2 reached maximum age, 22 dropped-out, and 2 exited as a result of death. For the purpose of conducting the Indicator 14 post-school outcomes survey in FFY 2016, FSM's total "leavers" was 72 from the 74 exiters in 2015-2016.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 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											

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥			

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

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 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	n	null

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0			0%

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**FFY 2016 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											

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	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 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	n	null

**FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	0			

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none



# FFY 2016 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	2016
Target ≥		14.00%	17.00%	21.00%
Data	12.00%	28.00%	25.00%	

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

## FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	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 2016 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 2016 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 2016 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:** Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name: Arthur Albert

Title: Part B Director

Email: aalbert@dss.edu.fm

Phone: 691-320-8982