

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The Federated States of Micronesia, Department of Education (NDOE) serves as the State Education Agency (SEA) responsible for the general supervision of special education and related services delivered in the four island states of Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap through their Departments of Education, known as the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). As the SEA, NDOE facilitated the development of the 2007-2008 FSM Annual Performance Report (APR) through verification of each LEA's Local Performance Plan (LPP). The LPP is a component of each LEA's application for Part B funding under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) and is aligned with the FSM State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator measurement requirements. The first LPP developed at each LEA was for 2005-2006, as described in the FSM Continuous Improvement Monitoring System procedures revised in July 2006. This reporting period therefore represents the third year for implementing the LEA application process with the development of each island state's LPP. While improvement still needs to be made in relation to the timely submission of the state LPPs, this year's submission have demonstrated greater accuracy and connection between performance data and associated improvement activities.

During the months of March 2008-December 2008 each LEA convened their special education advisory panel for the development of their IDEA Part B Local Performance Plan (LPP) for school year 2007-2008. The LPP follows the same indicator measures as the FSM SPP, but with focus on the LEA implementation of priorities established in the FSM SPP. The progress data reviewed in the LPP included the 2005-2006, 2006-2007, and 2007-2008 data for each SPP/LPP Indicator. In addition, a review of the SPP/APR requirements with a copy of the OSEP Determination Letter and Response Table, dated June 6, 2008, was shared as a review of the alignment of the LEA quarterly and annual (LPP) reporting with the overall FSM SPP and Annual Performance Report (APR) requirements. The meetings provided an opportunity for the LEA to verify the validity and reliability of the LEA-level data. The LEA special education advisory panel, comprised of agency representatives, parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, community representatives, and Department of Education including special education personnel, met as follows:

- Kosrae State: March 10-14, 2008; April 8, 2008; July 10, 2008; September 2, 2008
- Chuuk State: November 2008
- Yap State: July 21 -25, 2008; October 1, 2008
- Pohnpei State: August 26, 2008.

During these LEA special education advisory panel meetings, stakeholders reviewed the LEA-specific performance for 2005-2006, 2006-2007, and 2007-2008 in relation to the overall FSM SPP targets and improvement activities. For this FSM APR development, the stakeholders reviewed LEA performance data for APR/LPP Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20. For OSEP reporting purpose for 2007-2008, Indicator 6 does not require reporting, Indicator 7 is reported in the updated SPP, and Indicators 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to the FSM. The LEAs reviewed and verified data to generate LEA-specific priorities for school year 2007-2008 and prepared their input for the overall FSM APR review scheduled in December 2008.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

The purpose for the review was to compile the aggregated LEA data and information for the overall FSM 2007-2008 APR, including recommendations for possible revisions to targets and improvement activities. The following sessions were held:

- **August 3, 2008**: The FSM National Special Education Coordinator's meeting was held in Guam to review 2007-2008 performance from each LEA through the development of their LPP. The four LEA LPP data aggregated at the SEA/National-level served as the basis for the FSM 2007-2008 APR. There were 10 members at the meeting, which included the LEA Special Education Coordinators, special education staff from Chuuk State, Kosrae State, Pohnpei State, and Yap State; and the FSM National Special Education Program Early Childhood Coordinator. As a result of reviewing the aggregate FSM data and implementation of improvement activities for each Indicator, an agreement was reached on specific "next steps" for each LEA to verify the data provided for final compilation and analysis of progress data for the SPP/APR Indicators.
- **September 24-28, 2008**: The FSM National SPP/APR Committee met in Chuuk State to review 2007-2008 performance from each LEA through the development of their LPP. The four LEA LPP data aggregated at the SEA/National-level served as the basis for the FSM 2007-2008 APR. There were 15 members at the meeting, which included the LEA Advisory Council Chairpersons; special education staff from Chuuk State, Kosrae State, Pohnpei State, and Yap State; and the FSM National Special Education Program Executive Director and the Early Childhood Coordinator. As a result of reviewing the aggregate FSM data and implementation of improvement activities for each Indicator, an agreement was reached on specific "next steps" for each LEA to verify the data provided for final compilation and analysis of progress data for the SPP/APR Indicators.
- **January 8-10, 2009**: The FSM National SPP/APR Committee met in Chuuk State to review 2007-2008 performance from each LEA through the development of their LPP. The four LEA LPP data aggregated at the SEA/National-level served as the basis for the FSM 2007-2008 APR. There were 12 members at the meeting, which included the LEA Advisory Council Chairpersons; special education staff from Chuuk State, Kosrae State, Pohnpei State, and Yap State; and the FSM National Special Education Program Executive Director and the Early Childhood Coordinator. As a result of reviewing the aggregate FSM data and implementation of improvement activities for each Indicator, an agreement was reached on specific "next steps" for each LEA to verify the data provided for final compilation and analysis of progress data for the SPP/APR Indicators.
- **January 12-16, 2009**: FSM Special Education and State Special Education Coordinators and staff participated in a Transition Planning and APR Clinic sponsored by the Western Regional Resource Center (WRRRC). These regional events held on Guam were design to provide additional insights for addressing the APR requirements with emphasis on Indicator 13.
- **February 2, 2009**: Final Part B APR submitted to OSEP

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

PUBLIC DISSEMINATION PLAN

As required, FSM NDOE will report annually to the public on the progress and/or slippage in meeting the 'measurable and rigorous targets' found in the SPP, which would include the performance on the targets in the SPP. For the 2007-2008 APR, the NDOE will implement the following public dissemination:

1. By February 9, 2009, upon submission of the FSM IDEA Part B APR to the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs on February 1, 2009, FSM NDOE, Special Education Program will e-mail the report to each LEA Special Education Coordinator and State Advisory Panel Chairperson for dissemination at the FSM State-level to the special education advisory panel members.
2. By May 4, 2009, FSM NDOE, Special Education Program will post the FSM IDEA Part B APR on the FSM National Department of Education Website: <http://www.fsmed.fm>. The FSM NDOE Secretary will distribute a memorandum to the President of FSM and Secretaries of other National Government agencies notifying them of the posting and the availability of the full report.
3. By May 15, 2009, a letter from the FSM NDOE Secretary to parents of children and youth with disabilities will be distributed via the LEA Directors of Education and Special Education Program. The letter will provide an explanation of the purpose for the FSM IDEA Part B APR, availability of the APR on the FSM National Government website, and LEA contact information for obtaining a full copy of the plan.
4. By June 1, 2009, a summary of the FSM IDEA Part B APR with contact information for obtaining a full copy of the plan and the updated plan will be announced, through the LEAs, on the local radio stations, as appropriate.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.

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

Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	76% of youth with IEPs will have graduated from high school with a regular diploma, which represents working towards being comparable to the percent of all youth graduating with a regular diploma.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

FSM's overall National data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008) of 81% exceeded the SPP target of 76%, which represents "progress" for this indicator. For this reporting period, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap States met the FSM State target set for 76%. As noted in the Table below, of the 43 seniors with IEPs across the four States, 35 or 81% graduated with a high school diploma.

Actual data by FSM States, Local Education Agencies (LEAs), for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

The following Tables show the breakdown of FSM's actual data by the four FSM State LEAs:

FSM Breakdown of State LEAs Percent of Students with IEPs who Graduated

State	# & % Graduates with a Diploma in FSM		
	2007-2008		
	#Seniors	#Graduates	%Graduated
CHUUK	8	4	50%
KOSRAE	17	16	94%
POHNPEI	13	10	77%
YAP	5	5	100%
TOTAL	43	35	35/43x 100 = 81%

FSM Special Education verified the following data reported by each State:

- Kosrae State had a significant increase from 8% reported for last year to 94% (16/17) graduation rate of seniors with IEPs for this reporting period.
- Pohnpei State reported that of the 13 seniors, 10 or 77% graduated.
- Yap State continues to graduate all seniors with IEPs and is at 100% (5/5).

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

- Chuuk State reported that 50% or 4 out of the 8 seniors completed their high school requirements.

It should be noted that given the small numbers that each of the FSM LEA reports, changes in numbers, even by 1, can significantly change the percentage reported.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

As noted in the SPP 2005, the “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 LEA 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 = 18 credits; Pohnpei 21 credits; and Yap = 20 credits. These requirements are consistent for students with and without disabilities. Although FSM exceeded its SPP target for this reporting year, States continue to report a low number of seniors with IEPs enrolled.

The following describes progress made on the implementation of the improvement activities identified in FSM’s SPP:

Improvement Activity 1: Facilitate training for secondary general education and special education teachers on effective strategies for providing secondary students with disabilities access to the general curriculum.

‘07-‘08 Progress: In November and December 2007, FSM Special Education facilitated training in collaboration with the University of Hawaii Pacific Outreach Initiative (POI) on secondary special education and transition services. In addition, further training was conducted for secondary teachers on the FSM Procedural Manual that incorporated the development of secondary transition goals and objectives.

Improvement Activity 2: Develop and implement a system for monitoring student progress in the general education program to support the completion of required credits, at each grade level, for graduation. Student progress data will assist each FSM State LEA to provide appropriate intervention, as needed.

‘07-‘08 Progress: With the implementation of the Student Information Tracking System (SITS), tracking of students with IEPs in high school is improved through specific exit and graduation data which is generated by SITS. In addition, State visits were conducted to provide on-site technical assistance and training for each State’s Special Education Coordinator, Data Manager, and Data Technician on verification of using the SITS data and strategies to compile individual state reporting requirements.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement
Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):**

The FSM SPP targets are appropriate and will not be revised at this time and FSM will continue to implement the improvement activities and monitor on an annual basis. Therefore, no additional improvement activities are needed.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.

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

Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	2.5% of youth with IEPs drop-out of high school.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

For the 2007-2008 reporting period, FSM's percentage of youth with IEPs who dropped out was 3% (13/383). The high school enrollment for 9th – 12th grade was verified through each FSM State LEA special education office and education data office.

FSM Breakdown of State LEAs Drop-Out Rates

2007-2008 School Year	# & % Drop-Outs in FSM		
	# 9 th -12 th Graders	#Drop-Outs	%Drop-Outs
CHUUK	114	4	3.5%
KOSRAE	57	5	8.8%
POHNPEI	179	2	1.1%
YAP	33	2	6%
TOTAL	383	13	13/383 x 100 = 3%

Actual data by FSM States, Local Education Agencies (LEAs), for FFY 2005 (2005-2006), FFY 2006 (2006-2007), and FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

The following tables show comparison data for FFY's 2005-2006 thru 2007-2008 for each LEA State.

CHUUK:

CHUUK State LEA	# & % Drop-Outs in Chuuk								
	2005-2006			2006-2007			2007-2008		
	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop- Outs	% Drop- Outs	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop- Outs	%Drop- Outs	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop- Outs	%Drop- Outs
Youth with IEPs	415	3	.7%	118	0	0%	114	4	3.5%

*Number represents drop-outs from 12th grade only

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

KOSRAE:

KOSRAE State LEA	# & % Drop-Outs in Chuuk								
	2005-2006			2006-2007			2007-2008		
	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop- Outs	% Drop- Outs	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop- Outs	%Drop- Outs	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop- Outs	%Drop- Outs
Youth with IEPs	116	0	0%	38	7	18%	57	5	8.8%

POHNPEI:

POHNPEI State LEA	# & % Drop-Outs in Chuuk								
	2005-2006			2006-2007			2007-2008		
	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop- Outs	% Drop- Outs	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop- Outs	%Drop- Outs	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop- Outs	%Drop- Outs
Youth with IEPs	80	3	4%	169	6	4%	179	2	1.1%

YAP:

YAP State LEA	# & % Drop-Outs in Chuuk								
	2005-2006			2006-2007			2007-2008		
	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop- Outs	% Drop- Outs	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop- Outs	%Drop- Outs	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop- Outs	%Drop- Outs
Youth with IEPs	21	1	5%	21	1	5%	33	2	6%

FSM's overall National data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008) of 3% did not meet the SPP target of 2.5% for this Indicator. However, this displays "**progress**" and a decrease by 1% (14/346) of the number of students dropping out of high school from last reporting period (FFY 2006).

Pohnpei State met the target at 1.1% (2/179) youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. Chuuk, Kosrae, and Yap State were the FSM States that did not meet the FSM National SPP target of 2.5% drop-out rate. For Yap State there was 2 out of 33, or 6% of students with IEPs that dropped out; Chuuk State, 4/114 or 3.5% dropped out for this reporting period. The state reporting a significant "**progress**" of students that dropped out was from Kosrae State, at a decrease of 10% reported last year to 8.8% or 5/57 for this reporting period. With the new administration, there was change of policy that ensures students with disabilities are not suspended because of poor academic performance.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

Although FSM did not meet its target set at 2.5% for this reporting period, FSM demonstrated "**progress**" at 3% which is an improvement from 4% last year. The percentage of students with IEPs that dropped out of high school decreased by 1% of from the data reported last year of 4%.

In April 2008, FSM State and National Education Administrators attended a 3-day meeting co-sponsored by the Western Regional Resource Center (WRRRC) and the Pacific Resources for Education and Learning (PREL) to discuss the importance of implementing Response to Intervention (RTI) and to have in place a comprehensive system that integrates assessment and intervention as a mechanism for maximizing student achievement and to reduce behavior

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

problems. The purpose of RTI is to identify students at risk for poor learning outcomes, monitoring student programs, and provide effective early intervention supports and services. As a result of this meeting, the Pacific jurisdictions agreed that further training and technical assistance is needed to support the implementation of RTI.

The States of Yap, Pohnpei, and Chuuk implemented an internal monitoring action plan that would trigger an IEP exit meeting for students and parents to discuss reasons for the student not attending school and if any additional supports and services are needed and provided to ensure that the student would elect to complete their high school years. The result of this action plan is evident with the decrease of students with IEPs dropping out of high school.

The following describes the progress made on improvement activities specified for this indicator:

Improvement Activity 1: During school year 2005-2006, FSM-HESA to ensure consistency in drop-out definition in all four LEAs, including considerations for appropriate grade assignments, to include drop-outs with and without disabilities.

'07-'08 Progress: Annual training was held during the Special Education Coordinators Meeting on April 12, 2008 on the FSM Special Education Handbook which defines "drop out" and procedures to ensuring that IEP exit meetings are held. The FSM Special Education Procedural Guidelines clearly defines procedures for maintaining and reporting students with IEPs that drop-out.

Improvement Activity 2: Beginning school year 2005-2006, interface SPP drop-out data requirements with EMIS and the special education Student Information Tracking System (SITS) for reporting accurate and timely data for all levels: School, LEA, and National, to include federal reporting for drop-out data (exit data for special education).

'07-'08 Progress: With the implementation of the Student Information Tracking System (SITS), tracking of students with IEPs dropping out of high school is improved through specific exit IEP meeting data that can be generated. In addition, State visits were conducted to provide on-site technical assistance and training for each State's Special Education Coordinator Manager, and Data Technician on verification of using the SITS data, to include reporting on dropout data and strategies to compile individual state reporting requirements.

Improvement Activity 3: Continue monitoring the collection of drop-out comparison data through LEA quarterly reports to FSM-HESA and the FSM-HESA on-site monitoring/verification visits, as scheduled during the school year.

'07-'08 Progress: To ensure continued monitoring and collection of drop-out comparison data, training is conducted during the beginning of

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

each school year, and continuously throughout the school year, as needed (example – when a new resource teacher is hired), held at the State level on the IEP procedures, particularly on procedures for students exiting the system. Special Education staff reviewed the procedures for conducting IEP exit meetings and monitoring special education students that may drop out, to ensure IEP exit meetings are held, which may result in students reconsidering dropping out and deciding to remain in school.

Each State LEA Special Education Coordinator submits program data reports, including drop-out data, on a quarterly basis to the FSM National Special Education Coordinator. These reports are reviewed during bi-annual Special Education Coordinator meetings, and during other regional meetings to verify data and discuss possible strategies for improvement.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

The FSM SPP targets are appropriate and will not be revised at this time and FSM will continue to implement the improvement activities and monitor on an annual basis. Therefore, no additional improvement activities are needed.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

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

Measurement:

A. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs)}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size in the State})] \times 100$.

B. Participation rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
- b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = $[(b) \div (a)] \times 100$);
- c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = $[(c) \div (a)] \times 100$);
- d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = $[(d) \div (a)] \times 100$); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = $[(e) \div (a)] \times 100$).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent = $[(b + c + d + e) \div (a)]$.

C. Proficiency rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
- b. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = $[(b) \div (a)] \times 100$);
- c. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = $[(c) \div (a)] \times 100$);
- d. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = $[(d) \div (a)] \times 100$); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = $[(e) \div (a)] \times 100$).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent = $[(b + c + d + e) \div (a)]$.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Not Applicable to FSM. B. 70% participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards. C. At least 2% increase in proficiency rate from the 2005-2006 performance percentage for children with IEPs who performed at the proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations, regular assessment with accommodations, alternate assessment against grade level standards, and against alternate achievement standards.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008): Refer to attached 618 Table 6

Measurement A: Does not apply to FSM.

Measurement B: Overall FSM Participation Rates

The Spring 2008 FSM National Standardized Test (NST) was administered to all students with and without disabilities in grades 6, 8 and 10, with the exception of Chuuk and Pohnpei states, where sampling was conducted. An alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (AA-AAS) was also administered to students with significant cognitive disabilities. As shown in the participation tables below, FSM's overall participation performance for Math was 55% and 66% for Reading.

2007-2008 National Standardized Test (NST)		3B. PARTICIPATION: MATH Assessment				
		Grade 6	Grade 8	Grade 10	TOTAL	
					#	%
a.	Children with IEPs	108	93	88	289	
b.	Regular assess with NO accommodations	44 (41%)	31 (33%)	7 (8%)	82	28%
c.	Regular assess with accommodations	39 (36%)	16 (17%)	10 (11%)	65	23%
d.	AA against grade-level achievement standards	FSM does not have an alternate assessment (AA) that tests children against grade-level achievement standards.				
e.	AA against alternate achievement standards	2 (2%)	3 (3%)	6 (7%)	11	4%
Overall: [(b+c+d+e) divided by a]		79% (85/108)	54% (50/93)	26% (23/88)	158	55%
Children with IEPs included in "a" but not included in the other subcategories:						
Absent		6	10	8	24	8%
Other (not administered)		17	33	57	107	37%

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

2007-2008 National Standardized Test (NST)		3B. PARTICIPATION: READING Assessment				
		Grade 6	Grade 8	Grade 10	TOTAL	
					#	%
a.	Children with IEPs	108	93	88	289	
b.	Regular assess with NO accommodations	58 (54%)	50 (54%)	8 (9%)	116	40%
c.	Regular assess with accommodations	39 (36%)	18 (19%)	12 (14%)	69	24%
d.	AA against grade-level achievement standards	FSM does not have an alternate assessment (AA) that tests children against grade-level achievement standards.				
e.	AA against alternate achievement standards	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	3 (3%)	6	2.0%
Overall: [(b+c+d+e) divided by a]		91% (98/108)	75% (70/93)	26% (23/88)	191	66%
Children with IEPs included in "a" but not included in the other subcategories:						
Absent		10	10	8	28	10%
Other (list reasons)		0	13	57	70	24%

Measurement C: Proficiency Rates

The Spring 2008 FSM National Standardized Test (NST) was administered to all students with and without disabilities in grades 6, 8 and 10, with the exception of Chuuk and Pohnpei states, where sampling was conducted. An alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (AA-AAS) was also administered to students with significant cognitive disabilities. As shown in the proficiency tables below, FSM's overall proficiency performance was 2% for both Math and Reading.

2007-2008 National Standardized Test (NST)		3C. PROFICIENCY: MATH Assessment				
		Grade 6	Grade 8	Grade 10	TOTAL	
					#	%
a.	Children with IEPs	108	93	88	289	
b.	Proficient or above in regular assess with NO accommodations	0	0	0	0	0%
c.	Proficient or above in regular assess with accommodations	1 (1%)	3 (3%)	1 (1%)	5	2%
d.	Proficient or above in AA against grade-level achievement standards	FSM does not have an alternate assessment (AA) that tests children against grade-level achievement standards.				
e.	Proficient or above in AA against alternate achievement standards	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	3 (3%)	6	2%
Overall: [(b+c+d+e) divided by a]		2 (2%)	5 (5%)	4 (5%)	11	4%

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

2007-2008 National Standardized Test (NST)		3C. PROFICIENCY: READING Assessment				
		Grade 6	Grade 8	Grade 10	TOTAL	
					#	%
a.	Children with IEPs	108	93	88	289	
b.	Proficient or above in regular assess with NO accommodations	0	0	0	0	0%
c.	Proficient or above in regular assess with accommodations	1 (1%)	3 (3%)	4 (5%)	8	3%
d.	Proficient or above in AA against grade-level achievement standards	FSM does not have an alternate assessment (AA) that tests children against grade-level achievement standards.				
e.	Proficient or above in AA against alternate achievement standards	0	1 (1%)	0	1	0.3%
Overall: [(b+c+d+e) divided by a]		1 (1%)	4 (4%)	4 (5%)	9	3%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

FSM did not meet its 2007-2008 overall target for participation performance of 70% with only 55% (158/289) for Math and 66% (191/289) participation performance for Reading. It should be noted, that even though the FSM did not meet its target, there was an increase from the 2006-2007 data (16/128=12%) of 24% for 6th grade (39/108=36%), an 8% increase for 8th grade from (9/100=9%) to (16/93=17%) and a 9% increase for 10th grade from (1/58=2%) to (10/88=11%) in the number of students who participated in the NST with accommodations. As a result of the development of the FSM's accommodations policy and procedures, and training conducted at the state level, IEP Teams are including discussions on determining appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities for instruction and participation in the NST, and accommodations are administered accordingly during the NST as per the students' IEP.

For the proficiency performance, FSM did not meet its target of a 2% increase from the 2005-2006 baseline of 7%. However, in comparison to last year's proficiency data, FSM increased the percentage for the math proficiency performance from 0% (0/286) in FFY 2006 to 4% (11/289).

One of the considerations for FSM not meeting the overall participation and proficiency targets could be due to the administration of the NST in Chuuk State and Pohnpei State. As noted under reasons for "Exempt for Other Reasons" in the attached 618 Table 6 and in the participation tables displayed in the Actual Data section of this Indicator, there were 107 students with IEPs who did not take the NST Math section and 70 students with IEPs who did not take the NST Reading section because they were assigned to classroom sections or schools where the NST was not administered. As discussed in the SPP submitted in December 2005, given Chuuk's geographic challenges, FSM administers the NST in Chuuk using a sampling process, which accounts for appropriate representation of school size for selected schools within and outside the Chuuk lagoon area. However, for this reporting year, Chuuk State's sampling selection resulted in only 5 out of the 37 schools that have students with IEPs were part of the 13 schools chosen to take the NST out of the 79 schools in the system. In Pohnpei State, only certain 10th grade classes or sections were included in the NST, which raised concerns regarding the process of selecting the classes that would be considered representative of 10th grade in Pohnpei State. With these issues, FSM chose to include the

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

“Exempt for Other Reasons” totals in the calculation as a means of monitoring how FSM, as a Nation, addresses the assessment participation requirements for all students.

Overall, in FY2007, there was a decrease in the number of students who were absent or for other reasons, did not participate in the Spring 2008 NST, which could have been attributed to the monitoring of participation data at both the National and State levels. FFY 2006 data reported there were 125 (44%) students for math and 128 (45%) for reading out of 286 students who were absent or exempt from taking the NST, with an overall percentage of 45%. In FY2007, FSM reported 45% of the students for math (131/289) and 35% (98/289) for reading, with an overall percentage of 40%, demonstrating a decrease of 5% in the number of students who were “exempt or absent” from participating in the NST.

OSEP Determination Letter and Response Table, June 6, 2008

In the June 6, 2008 OSEP Response Table, OSEP noted in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, FSM must provide updated information on the status of the implementation of its alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (AA-AAS).

FSM is reporting an increase of 2% in the number of students participating in the AA-AAS. As reported in FFY 2006, there was only 1% (3/286) of students who participated in the AA-AAS for both math and reading, as compared to the data for FFY 2007, reporting an overall percentage of 3% [4% (11/289) for math and 2% (6/289) for Reading]. This progress demonstrates an increased awareness of the participation requirements of students with disabilities in the NST and AA-AAS, which can be attributed to the ongoing technical support provided through the OSEP-funded regional project, the PAC6 Projects, administered by the University of Guam CEDDERS.

Since 2005, the Pacific Assessment Consortium (PAC6), comprised of the six Pacific entities, including the FSM, prioritized facilitating technical support in the re-design and improvement of each Pacific Basin entity’s system of assessments. Through OSEP-funded grants, Guam CEDDERS has facilitated regional institutes and on-site technical assistance support to the FSM in addressing the inclusion of students with disabilities in the FSM’s state-wide assessment system, including an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards. In 2006, FSM went through a self-assessment process to evaluate its inclusive system of assessments, including an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (AA-AAS). The self-assessment tool utilized was adapted from the NCLB Peer Review Guidance from April 2004. This evaluation process was completed in October 2007 with the self-assessment tool posted on the PAC6 website: www.pac6.org/fsm. With the priorities for improvement identified in FSM’s self-assessment tool, FSM participated in the PAC6 regional and on-site events to support local capacity building for improving the accuracy of reporting participation and performance data for students with disabilities in FSM’s system of assessments. For this reporting period, FSM participated in the July 2007 PAC6 regional institute held in Pohnpei and the January 2008 PAC6 regional institute held in Palau. These institutes reviewed the requirements for reporting participation and performance data, with a focus on the development of FSM’s AA-AAS. As a follow-up to the institutes, Guam CEDDERS facilitated an on-site visit in October 2007 and March 2008 that focused on strategies for monitoring appropriate testing accommodations and training on the development and implementation of an AA-AAS. The on-site visits also included training designed for teachers

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

and support personnel on the “4-Step Process,” an instructional design for accessing the general curriculum for students with significant cognitive disabilities.

FSM guidance documents, such as the Accommodations Manual and the AA-AAS Teacher’s Guide, were developed to support the on-site PAC6 training activities. These documents have been posted on the PAC6 website: www.pac6.org/fsm. Training and discussion around AA-AAS scoring have been held monthly meetings beginning in January 2008. The individuals who comprised the state-wide scoring of alternate assessments were provided resources and guidance from the PAC6 Leadership Team. De-briefing sessions followed the state-wide scoring with revisions made to the process and accompanying documents. Guidelines to scoring AA-AAS are included in *FSM’s AA-AAS Teachers’ Guide*.

Improvement Activity 1: Full implementation of the special education procedures for determining “participation” in the state-wide assessment system, including as alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (AA-AAS).

07-‘08 Progress: FSM continues to work with the general education assessments units at both its SEA and LEA levels to ensure procedures are implemented and students are appropriately assessed and reported. FSM has in place special education procedures that provide specific steps for the IEP team to determine individually whether the student is able to participate, in all or part, of the NST with or without accommodations, or whether an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards would be required. Training continues to be conducted on with the FSM State LEAs regarding the implementation of these “participation determination” procedures, and as evidenced through this year’s reporting, the implementation of the IEP “participation determination” and monitoring of test administration procedures resulted in the reporting of student participation data for students with IEPs who took the NST with or without accommodations or through an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards.

Improvement Activity 2: Pilot implementation of an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards for targeted Reading and Math skills for reporting accurate participation and performance data for students with significant cognitive disabilities who are not able to take the NST in the 2006- 2007 school year.

07-‘08 Progress: **Completed.** In July 2007, the GSEG PAC6 regional institute was held in Pohnpei, FSM. The institute provided technical support to all the jurisdictions in standard setting, rubric development, and scoring the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (AA-AAS). During the one-week intensive institute, FSM was able to score the 3 student portfolios-the body of evidence-gathered for the 2006-2007 pilot implementation, as reported in the FFY 2006 APR.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

In January 2008, a one-week Institute was held on Palau to further the knowledge and skills of the Pacific Basin PAC6 Leadership Assessment Teams on content and strategies for enhancing their inclusive assessment system. FSM's Leadership Assessment Team of key leadership personnel participated in the Institute, resulting in improved capacity to accurately report on the performance and participation of students with disabilities in each entity's assessment system. Follow-up on-site technical assistance visits to Chuuk State in October 2007 and Kosrae State in March 2008 conducted by Guam CEDDERS and the UOG regional expert supported the implementation of FSM's AA-AAS, with training provided to over fifty (50) general education and special education teachers, Related Service Assistants (RSAs) and School Administrators. Representatives from FSM National Assessment Office and Special Education Program, as well as LEA representatives from Pohnpei State, Chuuk State, and Yap State participated in each of the one-week visits.

Additional technical support will be provided through the GSEG PAC6 Projects during the 2008-2009 to ensure full implementation of FSM's AA-AAS.

Improvement Activity 3:

The completion of a jurisdiction specific FSM plan utilizing a self-assessment process following the NCLB Peer Review Guidance, as adapted by the GSEG PAC6 Project.

07-'08 Progress:

Completed. The Secretary of Education endorsed the *Pacific Basin Self Assessment for the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM)* on October 10, 2007, which serves as FSM's "action plan" for improving their nation-wide assessment system.

The *Pacific Basin Self Assessment for the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM)*, adapted from the 2004 No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Peer Review Guidance, was designed to document the needs for improvement unique to the FSM. The self-assessment tool outlines the components for meeting the standards and assessment requirements and provides guidance for assisting the FSM Department of Education with developing a comprehensive, inclusive assessment system. This planning document will be used as FSM's jurisdiction plan to formulate a design for implementing a strong system of assessment and instruction that addresses the needs of students with disabilities through the use of assessments that produce valid, reliable, and accurate measures of student performance, resulting in high quality data for use in evaluating the performance of schools.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Improvement Activity 4: Implementation of the jurisdiction specific FSM plan for re-designing/enhancing FSM's state-wide assessment system, including the determination and implementation of appropriate accommodations for the general assessment, the development of an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards, and the facilitation of on-site training for administrators, teachers, and parents in each FSM State LEA.

07-'08 Progress: Refer to progress noted for Improvement Activities 1-3.

Improvement Activity 5: Beginning school year 2006-2007, interface SPP assessment data requirements with EMIS and the special education Student Information Tracking System (SITS) for reporting accurate and timely data for all levels: School, LEA, and National, to include federal reporting for assessment data.

07-'08 Progress: With the implementation of the Student Information Tracking System (SITS), information and data reports of students participating in the statewide assessment with or without accommodations and alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards are obtained. In addition, State visits were conducted to provide on-site technical assistance and training for each State's Special Education Coordinator, Data Manager, and Data Technician on verification of using the SITS data, to include reporting on participation status and strategies to compile individual state reporting requirements.

Progress continues on the interface of the EMIS and SITS data systems.

Refer to progress noted in Indicator 20 on the SITS.

Improvement Activity 6: Continue monitoring the implementation of the special education procedures for participation rate, as well as proficiency rates, in the nation-wide assessment system, including the provisions for appropriate accommodations and an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards, in each LEA through the LEA quarterly reports to FSM-HESA and the FSM-HESA on-site monitoring/verification visits, as scheduled during the school year.

07-'08 Progress: In addition to the FSM monitoring visits, the GSEG PAC6 Projects have been able to support the bi-annual regional institutes with specific follow-up on-site visits, as described in the progress noted for Improvement Activities 1-4. This training and technical assistance support have provided opportunities for key FSM National and State representatives to engage in the development and

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

implementation of the specific “next steps” for improving the reporting of accurate data on the participation and performance of students with IEPs in FSM’s NST, including an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards. Continued technical support will be provided through the GSEG PAC6 Projects for the next three years.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

No adjustments to the targets and improvement activities, at this time. As mentioned, through continued GSEG PAC6 Project funding, FSM is committed to implementing the critical changes for building local capacity for an improved nation-wide assessment system, inclusive of students with disabilities.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:
 A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and
 B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.

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

Measurement:
 A. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
 B. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
 Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>Rates of suspension and expulsion: A. 0% of districts/LEAs identified by FSM as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and B. Not Applicable to FSM.</p>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

Measurement A: Suspension Data Greater than 10 Days by FSM Local Education Agencies (LEAs)

As shown in the following tables, FSM met its target of 0% significant discrepancy of LEAs. FSM is not reporting any significant discrepancies for this reporting period with two states reporting rates ranging from .3% to .8%: a comparison difference of only .5%. The FSM reported any student with an IEP with a single suspension greater than 10 days or multiple suspensions greater than 10 days for 2007-2008 in the 618 Discipline Table 5.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

CHUUK:

Child Count Reporting Period	Total # with IEPs*	Chuuk Reported 618 Suspension Data for the School Year					
		Single Suspensions > than 10 Days		Multiple Suspensions > than 10 Days		TOTAL # & %	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2005	1312	0	0	0	0	0	0%
December 1, 2006	628	0	0	0	0	0	0%
December 1, 2007	593	0	0	0	0	0	0%

*Child Count Total for Ages 3-21

KOSRAE:

Child Count Reporting Period	Total # with IEPs*	Kosrae Reported 618 Suspension Data for the School Year					
		Single Suspensions > than 10 Days		Multiple Suspensions > than 10 Days		TOTAL # & %	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2005	270	0	0	0	0	0	0%
December 1, 2006	153	0	0	0	0	0	0%
December 1, 2007	186	0	0	0	0	0	0%

*Child Count Total for Ages 3-21

POHNPEI:

Child Count Reporting Period	Total # with IEPs*	Pohnpei Reported 618 Suspension Data for the School Year					
		Single Suspensions > than 10 Days		Multiple Suspensions > than 10 Days		TOTAL # & %	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2005	913	0	0	0	0	0	0%
December 1, 2006	693	0	0	0	0	0	0%
December 1, 2007	734	2	.3%	0	0	2	.3%

*Child Count Total for Ages 3-21

YAP:

Child Count Reporting Period	Total # with IEPs*	Yap Reported 618 Suspension Data for the School Year					
		Single Suspensions > than 10 Days		Multiple Suspensions > than 10 Days		TOTAL # & %	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2005	124	0	0	0	0	0	0%
December 1, 2006	124	0	0	0	0	0	0%
December 1, 2007	123	0	0	1	.8%	1	.8%

*Child Count Total for Ages 3-21

Measurement B: By Race and Ethnicity – The majority of the FSM children with disabilities reported under the “Asian/Pacific Islander” category. Measurement B does not apply to the FSM.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

OSEP Determination Letter and Response Table , June 6, 2008

As noted in the June, 2008 letter from OSEP FSM must describe the results of FSM's examination of data from FFY 2007. As noted above, FSM is not reporting any significant discrepancies for this reporting period with two states reporting rates ranging from .3% to .8%: a comparison difference of only .5%.

The following describes progress made on the implementation of the improvement activities identified in FSM's SPP:

Improvement Activity 1: During school year 2005-2006, FSM-HESA to ensure consistency in "suspension/expulsion" definition in all four LEAs.

'07-'08 Progress: The FSM National Special Education continues to use FSM HESA's definition for suspension/expulsion of the Education management Information System (EMIS). FSM Special Education Coordinators submit quarterly reports that include data on suspension/expulsion of students with IEPs greater than 10 days. FSM National Special Education Data Manager reviews and verifies reports for consistency and accuracy.

Improvement Activity 2: Beginning school year 2005-2006, interface SPP suspension/expulsion data requirements with EMIS and the special education Student Information Tracking System (SITS) for reporting accurate and timely data for all levels: School, LEA, and National, to include federal reporting for discipline data.

'07-'08 Progress: With the implementation of the Student Information Tracking System (SITS), information and data reports of students with IEPs who were suspended/expelled greater than 10 days are obtained. In addition, State visits were conducted to provide on-site technical assistance and training for each State's Special Education Coordinator, Data Manager, and Data Technician on verification of using the SITS data, to include reporting on suspension/expulsion rates and strategies to compile individual state reporting requirements.

Progress continues on the interface of the EMIS and SITS data systems.

Improvement Activity 3: Continue monitoring the implementation of the special education procedures for accounting for suspension/expulsion data through FSM LEA quarterly reports to FSM-HESA and the FSM-HESA on-site monitoring/verification visits, as scheduled during the school year.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

'07-'08 Progress: See progress in Improvement Activities 1 and 2.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

The FSM SPP targets are appropriate and will not be revised at this time and FSM will continue to implement the improvement activities and monitor on an annual basis. Therefore, no additional improvement activities are needed.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:
 A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;¹
 B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or
 C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

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

Measurement:

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	Based on the unique needs of each child with a disability, on December 1, 2007, the percent of children with IEPs ages 6 through 21 served to include: A. 97.25% Served inside regular class 80% or more of the day; B. .25% Served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and C. 2.25% Served in separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

¹ At the time of the release of this package, revised forms for collection of 618 State reported data had not yet been approved. Indicators will be revised as needed to align with language in the 2005-2006 State reported data collections.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

FSM DATA: OSEP 618 LRE Placement Data

Reporting Period	FSM Total # with IEPs	% Regular Class (ages 6 through 21)					
		Measurement A Served 80% or more		Measurement B Served less than 40%		Measurement C Separate Schools, Residential, Homebound, Hospital Placements	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2004	2163	2099	97%	0	0	64	3%
December 1, 2005	2299	2147	93%	0	0	152	7%
December 1, 2006	1495	1347	90%	38	3%	97	6%
December 1, 2007	1513	1277	84%	105	7%	102	7%

OSEP 618 LRE Placement Data by FSM LEAs for FFYs 2002-2007:

CHUUK: 2002-2007: Number & Percentage of Students (Age 6-21) By Educational Environment

Reporting Period	CHUUK Total # with IEPs	% Regular Class (ages 6 through 21)					
		Measurement A Served 80% or more		Measurement B Served less than 40%		Measurement C Separate Schools, Residential, Homebound, Hospital Placements	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2002	770	716	93%	0	0	54	7%
December 1, 2003	867	867	100%	0	0	0	0
December 1, 2004	990	990	100%	0	0	0	0
December 1, 2005*	1073	976	91%	0	0	97	9%
December 1 2006	590	524	89%	0	0	53	9%
December 1, 2007	536	482	90%	0	0	54	10%

*Chuuk State revised 618 School-Age LRE data submitted to FSM-HESA; FSM-HESA submitted correction of FSM total to WESTAT

KOSRAE: 2002-2007: Number & Percentage of Students (Age 6-21) By Educational Environment

Reporting Period	KOSRAE Total # with IEPs	% Regular Class (ages 6 through 21)					
		Measurement A Served 80% or more		Measurement B Served less than 40%		Measurement C Separate Schools, Residential, Homebound, Hospital Placements	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2002	232	203	88%	0	0	29	12%
December 1, 2003	311	295	95%	0	0	16	5%
December 1, 2004	222	198	89%	0	0	24	11%
December 1, 2005	240	219	91%	0	0	21	9%
December 1, 2006	134	112	84%	0	0	22	16%
December 1, 2007	164	144	88%	0	0	20	12%

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

POHNPEI: 2002-2007: Number & Percentage of Students (Age 6-21) By Educational Environment

Reporting Period	POHNPEI Total # with IEPs	% Regular Class (ages 6 through 21)					
		Measurement A Served 80% or more		Measurement B Served less than 40%		Measurement C Separate Schools, Residential, Homebound, Hospital Placements	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2002	822	746	91%	44	5%	32	4%
December 1, 2003	808	784	97%	0	0	24	3%
December 1, 2004	792	773	98%	0	0	19	2%
December 1, 2005	869	845	97%	0	0	24	3%
December 1, 2006	655	610	93%	31	5%	14	2%
December 1, 2007	697	554	79%	105	15%	9	1%

YAP: 2002-2007: Number & Percentage of Students (Age 6-21) By Educational Environment

Reporting Period	YAP Total # with IEPs	% Regular Class (ages 6 through 21)					
		Measurement A Served 80% or more		Measurement B Served less than 40%		Measurement C Separate Schools, Residential, Homebound, Hospital Placements	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2002	216	177	82%	21	10%	18	8%
December 1, 2003	216	175	81%	23	11%	18	8%
December 1, 2004	159	138	87%	0	0	21	13%
December 1, 2005	117	107	91%	0	0	10	9%
December 1, 2006	116	101	87%	7	6%	8	6%
December 1, 2007	116	97	84%	0	0	19	16%

Of the 1513 students with IEPs aged 6 to 21 served, 84% or 1277 are served inside regular class 80% or more of the time, 7% or 105 are served in regular class less than 40% of the day, and 7% or 102 are in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

As of this reporting period, FSM did not meet its SPP targets for all three of the Indicator Measurements in 2007-2008:

- **Measurement A:** Served 80% or more: Target set at 97.25%, with performance at 84%.
- **Measurement B:** Served less than 40%: Target set at .25%, with performance at 7%.
- **Measurement C:** Separate Schools/Homebound: Target set at 2.25%, with performance at 7%.

FSM did not meet the target set for Measurement A of 97.25% with the performance for this reporting period of 84% (1277/1513). In reviewing the trend data displayed in the State Tables above, Pohnpei and Yap decreased in the number of students served inside regular class 80%

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

or more for last reporting period and this reporting period. Chuuk and Kosrae States increased in the numbers served for Measurement A.

For Measurement B, FSM did not meet the target set of .25% with a performance of 7%. Chuuk, Kosrae, and Yap State do not have students with IEPs served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day for this reporting period. As noted in the table above, Pohnpei State indicated 105 of the 697 students or 15% are served inside regular classroom less than 40% of the day. This represents a 10% increase from FFY 2006 of 5%. The reason for the increase is the placement of students that were receiving home services are now receiving services in special education resource rooms in high school settings.

For Measurement C, FSM did not meet the target set for 2.5%. Yap State reported a slight increase in the percentage of the number of students with IEPs in separate schools or homebound placement from 6% to 7%. Pohnpei State decreased to 1% from 2% reported last year. Kosrae State reported a decrease of 4% from 16% reported in FFY 2006 to 12% for this reporting period.

FSM National supported training and on-site technical assistance to States in working with students with specific disabilities through teacher training, mentoring, and parent supports. These trainings included the following:

- In January, 2008, Dr. Kelly Roberts and Ms. Mellanie Lee, consultants from University of Hawaii, Center for Disabilities Studies (UOH-UCE), held trainings for early childhood teachers on strategies in working with young children with autism in Pohnpei State. In addition, parent meetings were held to share strategies to families and help to develop roles for parents to assist in the implementation of related services unique to their child's IEP.
- In February, 2008, Dr. Kelly Robert, and Ms. Melani Lee, consultants from UOH-CED, facilitated training behavior and communication strategies for students with IEPs in Yap State. Administrators, teachers, and parents were in attendance.
- In June, 2008, training on connecting standards, benchmarks, and functional assessment for students with significant disabilities was facilitated by Dr. Katherine Ratliffe, and Ms. Margo Wray, Consultants from UOH-UCD. In addition, Related Service Assistants received training on feeding and the families role and responsibilities.
- In July, 2008, Dr. Jennifer Tarney and Ms. Melani Lee, Consultants from the UOH-UCE facilitated on-site training in Kosrae State in language and communication skills. In addition, training on the development and implementation of IEP plans were reviewed.
- In March, 2008, training and technical assistance was held in Kosrae State as part of the Pacific Assessment Consortium (PAC6) Implementation Project funded by OSEP. Training included revising the criteria for participation in an alternate assessment implementing and monitoring the use of accommodations in the National Standardized Test.

The following describes progress made during the reporting year on the implementation of the improvement activities identified in FSM's SPP:

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Improvement Activity 1: During school year 2006-2007 full implementation of the special education Student Information Tracking System (SITS) will provide for the collection and reporting of accurate and timely data for all levels: School, LEA, and National, to include federal reporting for School-Age LRE – Educational Environments

'07-'08- Progress: Please see discussion on progress/ slippage in Indicator 20.

Improvement Activity 2: Parent and staff training implemented for each LEA to ensure understanding of the June 2005 revisions to the Special Education Procedural Manual, to include a review of the LRE provisions, based on the IDEA 2004 and proposed regulations, as well as effective strategies for providing special education and related services in general education program environments.

'07-'08- Progress: As indicated in the discussion, State specific training were held to support administrators, teachers, and parents in assessing students and developing and implementing appropriate IEPs to meet the needs of the student. Training provided for coaching and mentoring of Related Service Assistance that work directly with students with significant disabilities.

Improvement Activity 3: Continue monitoring the provisions of LRE through the LEA quarterly reports and FSM NDOE on-site monitoring/verification visits, as scheduled during the school year.

'07-'08 Progress: FSM conducts on-site monitoring and verification to each LEA within the calendar year. For this reporting year, FSM Special Education verified correction for this indicator. The following list describes verification:

- Annual IEP Review requirements were not met for all children with IEPs in all four FSM States or LEAs. As documented in the FFY 2007 FSM Monitoring Reports, Kosrae State and Yap State, 2 of the 4 LEAs, met the correction requirement for this noncompliance finding.
- Documented descriptions of the Continuum of Alternative Placements were not in place in 3 of the 4 LEAs: Kosrae State, Pohnpei State, Yap State. During the FFY 2007 FSM on-site monitoring visits, evidence was provided by all 3 LEAs of having a description of the Continuum of Alternative Placements.
- Other: 100% (1/1) Verified Correction for this Other Area: An Interagency Agreement was not in effect in 1 of the 4 LEAs: Chuuk State. The FFY 2007 FSM Monitoring Report indicated correction of this noncompliance.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement
Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):**

The FSM SPP targets are appropriate and will not be revised at this time and FSM will continue to implement the improvement activities and monitor on an annual basis. Therefore, no additional improvement activities are needed.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

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

Measurement: Percent = [(# of preschool children with IEPs who received special education services in settings with typically developing peers) divided by the (total # of preschool children with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	
2006 (2006-2007)	
2007 (2007-2008)	
2008 (2008-2009)	
2009 (2009-2010)	
2010 (2010-2011)	

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

STATES DO NOT NEED TO REPORT FOR FFY 07-08

Baseline Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

No Baseline Data is Required

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: 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))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	60% of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

FSM HESA continues to use the FSM Family Outcome Survey (adapted from the ECO Family Survey) as a means of collecting data from parents of children receiving special education services that report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for their children with disabilities.

Of the 1,638 students with IEPs, 527 or 32% of parents responded to the FSM Family Outcome Survey. The following Table provides the percentage of respondents by each State.

STATE	# Students w/IEPs	# of Repondents	% of Responsents
Chuuk	593	40	7%
Kosrae	188	142	70%
Pohnpei	734	290	40%
Yap	123	55	45%
Total	1638	527	32%

*Based on the 618, Data Table 1 Child Count for December 1, 2007.

There are a total of 17 survey items (A thru Q) related to parent involvement in their children's education as a means of improving services and results for their child with a disability.

A 7 point rating scale is used and divided into three categories to assess if families *disagree*, *agree* or *strongly agree* about the statements. The following statements show the rating categories used:

- Ratings 1 and 2: Parents **DISAGREE** that the school encouraged you to be actively involved in your child's education at school

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

- Ratings 3, 4, and 5: Parents **AGREE** that the school encouraged you to be actively involved in your child’s education at school; and
- Ratings 6 and 7: Parents **STRONGLY AGREE** that the school encouraged you to be actively

The total responses for each survey item A thru Q are calculated. Percentages are calculated based on the total number of each rating from 1 thru 7 divided by the total number of survey responses. The Table below shows a breakdown of responses by rating category for each State as well as the aggregate percentage in response to this APR indicator.

STATE	TOTAL # RESPONSES	DISAGREE (RATINGS 1,2)	AGREE (RATINGS 3,4,5)	STRONGLY AGREE (RATINGS 6,7)	TOTAL PERCENT AGREE/STRONGLY AGREE
CHUUK	679	7% (49/679)	61% (415/679)	32% (215/679)	93% (630/679)
KOSRAE	2360	8% (186/2360)	67% (1571/2360)	26% (603/2360)	92% (2174/2360)
POHNPEI	3962	22% (867/3962)	50% (1982/3962)	28% (1113/3962)	78% (3095/3962)
YAP	850	26% (219/850)	54% (463/850)	20% (168/850)	74% (631/850)
TOTAL	7851	20% (1321/7851)	56% (4431/7851)	27% (2099/7851)	83% (6530/7851)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

Based on the Table above, results of the FSM Family Outcome Survey showed that a total of 83% or 437 out of the 527 parents that completed the survey, responded that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. The FSM exceeded its target of 60% for this reporting period with a performance of 23% above the target.

In previous reporting years, FSM used Question P: “To what extent has your child’s school program encouraged you to be actively involved in your child’s education at school?” Based on the 7-point rating scale at total of 93% of parents responded that they Agree and Strongly Agree that their child’s school program encouraged active involvement in their child’s education. With this percentage, FSM still exceeds the target of 60% with a performance of 92%, a performance of 32% above the target.

There was a total return rate of 32% or 527 of the total 1638 surveys received. Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap states all had a return rate ranging from 40% to 70%. Kosrae State had the highest return rate of all the four states of 70% or 142 out of 188 surveys. This is because Kosrae State is a one island entity which makes it easier to disseminate surveys to parents and follow up for submission. Yap State had the second highest return rate of 45% or 55 out of 123 surveys. Lastly, Pohnpei State had a return rate of 40% or 290 out of 734 surveys. Although Yap and Pohnpei are made up of several islands, there are easier methods for dissemination, communication, and follow up in ensuring the receipt of completed surveys.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

There was a low return rate in Chuuk of 7% or 40 out of the 593 surveys disseminated. Reasons for the low return rate are due to geographical challenges in disseminating and receiving the surveys. Furthermore, completed surveys were not returned from the outer islands as well as there was a late submission of surveys which were unable to be included in the final analysis of the aggregated surveys.

The following are progress updates to the improvement activities:

Improvement Activity 1: A parent focus group, comprised of parent representatives from each FSM State, will review and revise, as needed, the FSM Family Survey with translations into the vernacular languages.

07'-08' Progress: Survey instrument was reviewed with no revisions made. Same survey instrument is being used for all four FSM States, which includes surveys translated into the vernacular languages.

Parent focus groups are conducted in each State, during the Spring of each year. Parents of children with disabilities are identified to participate in the focus groups and training is provided on how to complete the survey form as well as procedures for disseminating, collecting, and aggregating the surveys in their respective states.

Improvement Activity 2: By the end of May each year, the FSM Family Survey will be disseminated to all parents of students with IEPs.

07'-08' Progress: The FSM Family Survey Forms were disseminated to all parents of children with disabilities in May of each year. Special Education staff and parent focus groups facilitate the dissemination and aggregation of results. Results from the surveys conducted in each State are submitted and reported to FSM National Special Education Office between June and July of each year, upon completion of results.

Improvement Activity 3: A variety of methods for gathering parent input will be developed and implemented as a means of gaining greater understanding of parents' perception, such as parent forums, parent focus groups, and the parent conference.

07'-08' Progress: Staff and parent meetings, parent forums, and parent training workshops are held during the school year. During these events, parents are given the opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback on the services and supports provided to their child with a disability. Special Education staff answers parents' questions and comments and uses the information to assist in program improvement.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Improvement Activity 4: FSM-HESA and each LEA Special Education Program will facilitate parent workshops that promote partnerships between schools and families to improve program services and results for children with disabilities.

07'-08' Progress: Pohnpei State conducted training on January 28 to February 1, 2008 for parents of children in the early childhood program on "Inclusion and Instruction Strategies for Children with Autism and the Development of a Communication Program".

Chuuk State conducted training June 15 to 21, 2008 for parents on "Family Roles and Responsibilities and Feeding for Children with Special Needs."

In Kosrae State, on June 30 to July 1, 2008, Jennifer Tarney, Veteran RSA – Speech/Language TA, and Melani Lee worked with teachers and visited families of children with severe speech language and communication problems. During the visits five student plans were completed and IEPs developed.

FSM Early Childhood Special Coordinator and a parent representative from Kosrae State attended the annual NECTAC National Technical Assistance conference in Baltimore, Maryland from August 26 to 29, 2007, entitled "Measuring Child and Family Outcomes". Training sessions attended included:

- Accountability for Part C and 619 from a family perspective
- Critical issues in early childhood assessment and accountability
- Interpreting and using child outcome data
- Analyzing Child Outcome Form (COSF) data
- Local benefits of implementing child outcome data collection
- Assuring the quality assessment data
- Benefits of aligning child outcome measurement to state early learning guideline standards
- Approaches for converting assessment data to OSEP Outcome

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

The FSM SPP targets are appropriate and will not be revised at this time and FSM will continue to implement the improvement activities and monitor on an annual basis. Therefore, no additional improvement activities are needed.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9: 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))

Measurement:
 Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
 Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”
 Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	Not Applicable to FSM

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

As reported in previous Annual Performance Reports and reported 618 Child Count Data, the majority of children with disabilities in the FSM in 2007-2008 continues to fall under the “Asian/Pacific islander” category, consistent with the school and community populations. Therefore, Indicator 9 does not apply to FSM.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: 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))

Measurement:
 Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
 Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”
 Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	New Indicator.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

As reported in previous Annual Performance Reports and reported 618 Child Count Data, the majority of children with disabilities in the FSM in 2007-2008 continues to fall under the “Asian/Pacific islander” category, consistent with the school and community populations. Therefore, Indicator 10 does not apply to FSM.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Plan Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline).

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

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).
- c. # determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of children with parental consent received were evaluated within 60 days.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

Following the measurement requirement for this indicator, the following Table shows data collected from each FSM State LEA for reporting period July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008:

FSM State	a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).	c. # determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).	Percent = [(b + c) divided by (a)] times 100 14 + 200 / 257 = .83 x 100 = 83%
Chuuk	57	11	46	100%
Kosrae	53	0	35	66%
Pohnpei	90	0	90	100%
Yap	57	3	29	56%
FSM Total	257	14	200	83%

There were 257 referrals for special education services with parental consent for this reporting period. **Of the 257 parent consents for evaluation, 214 were determined eligible or not eligible and evaluations completed within the 60 days.**

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

As noted in the SPP report for 2005-2006, the *FSM Special Education Procedural Guidelines* describes the data collection process that take into account the “date of receipt” of parental consent as the start of the 60-day timeline. The FSM Special Education Information Tracking System (SITS) is used at each state and provides the data elements for tracking of procedural timelines. Based on the data provided from the four FSM States for this reporting period, FSM’s performance is at 83% or 214 out of 257 evaluations completed within the 60 days timeline. FSM has shown significant “**progress**” from last years reporting at 67% (148/221) to 83% (214/257). The breakdown by FSM state LEA reported percentage and number of parent permission “received” and evaluations completed within 60 days for a total of 214 includes:

- Chuuk State: 100% (57/57 completed within the 60 day timeline)
- Kosrae State: 66% (35/53 completed within 60-day timeline)
- Pohnpei State: 100% (90/90 completed within 60-day timeline)
- Yap State: 56% (32/57 within 60-day timeline)

As noted above, Chuuk and Pohnpei States are at 100% compliance. Yap State and Kosrae State reported noncompliance with this requirement reporting the following range of days for completion and reasons for the delay: For Yap State there were a total of 25 out of 57 (44%) parent consents for evaluation received for which no evaluations were completed within the 60-day timeline. The table below provides the range of days for the completion of the 25 evaluations beyond the 60-day timeline.

YAP STATE: Range of Days Beyond the 60 Day Timeline

Range of Days	Number of Students
61 to 120 days	2
121 to 180 days	16
181 to 240 days	7
TOTAL	25

The reason for the delay in completing the evaluations was a misunderstanding with the procedures, due to reassignment of staff that were unfamiliar with the evaluation process for school-age students, versus young children. In which case the staff were requiring all referred students to go through medical evaluations at the Children with Special Healthcare Needs (CSHN) Clinic - which resulted in delays and affecting the 60-day timeline requirement. It was later clarified that the medical evaluations are only required for children birth to 3, as indicated in the *Yap State Guidelines for Early Care and Education for Young Children with Special Needs*.

As a result of the noncompliance, Yap State has reviewed the procedures and developed a checklist for staff to use when referring students for evaluations. Training was then conducted to all staff on the procedures, as per the *FSM Special Education Procedural Guidelines*, and the newly developed checklist. Yap State progress data was collected between September 2008 – January 2009, with six new referrals with consent to evaluate and all 6 were completed within the 60-day timeline - meeting 100% compliance.

For Kosrae State there were a total of 18 out of 53 (34%) parent consents for evaluation received for which no evaluations were completed within the 60-day timeline. Of the 18

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

evaluations needed, 15 were completed between 61 to 120 days, 2 students withdrew from school, and one parent refused evaluation services after giving initial consent for evaluation. The reason for the delay in completing the evaluations was due to the change in administration and the redefining of the roles and responsibilities of critical related service personnel. Kosrae reported progress date from July 2008 to September 2008. Of 10 referrals with consent to evaluate, all 10 were completed and determined eligible within the 60-day timeline.

OSEP Determination Letter and Response Table, June 6, 2008

In the June 2008 OSEP Response Table, OSEP noted that it was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 data are not comparable. OSEP also noted that FSM included data from Chuuk in the FFY 2006 calculation for this indicator that were not included in the FFY 2005 calculation. It further noted the development of a corrective action plan by FSM to address the noncompliance. Lastly, OSEP noted that FSM must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable FSM to provide data in this APR reporting period, demonstrating that FSM is in compliance with the timely evaluation requirements, including reporting correction of non-compliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.

It should be noted that Indicator 15 of this APR reported Indicator 11 as an outstanding noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2005 and not corrected in FFY 2006. Specifically, Chuuk State and Kosrae State were found to be out of compliance with the 60-day timeline requirement. Therefore, FSM did not identify Indicator 11 as a finding of noncompliance for FFY 2006 because the 60-day requirement was not corrected for that year, which required correction of the individual noncompliance and verification of correction through a review of additional data representing 100% compliance with the requirement.

As reported in the FFY 2006 APR, Chuuk State and Kosrae State were found to be noncompliant for this indicator, reporting only 63% (36/57) for Kosrae and 0% for Chuuk.

The NDOE Special Education Office conducted State Level monitoring visits to Chuuk in March 10-16, 2008 and Kosrae in April 21-25, 2008 to verify implementation of corrective action plans developed to address the noncompliance. It was noted that Kosrae State has implemented an internal tracking system for monitoring documentation requirements for each step of the special education process, demonstrating progress for ensuring compliance of new referrals with consent to evaluate are completed within the 60-day timeline.

Based on the Monitoring report for Kosrae State for FFY 2007-08, Kosrae State received 19 referrals and 1 (5%) was completed within the 60-day timeline. As a result, the Monitoring Team made the determination that Kosrae State Special Education Program continues to be in a Needs Assistance level. On May 12, 2008, Kosrae State Special Education submitted a quarterly progress report to the FSM Special Education Office documenting completion of the 18 remaining evaluations. The report also stated that of the 53 students referred for special education services in FFY2007, 35 (66%) evaluations were completed within the 60-day timeline, showing progress towards compliance. In addition, the report showed completion of the 37% (21/57) over due evaluations from FFY 2006. Further, Kosrae State reported progress data from July 2008 to September 2008. Of the 10 referrals with consent to evaluate, all 10 were completed and determined eligible within the 60-day timeline. This verification of correction therefore provides the evidence of Kosrae State's subsequent correction.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

As a result of the technical assistance provided to Chuuk State Special Education Program, with activities and timelines identified in the Corrective Action Plan, Chuuk State completed the 52 evaluations reported in the FFY 2006, as well as all 57 referrals for evaluations for FFY2007, demonstrating progress towards compliance with this indicator.

Chuuk was able to demonstrate that all 52 evaluations overdue in FFY 2006 have all been completed. Progress data has been provided for Chuuk State related to the 60-day timeline requirement. An on-site verification visit was conducted January 28-30, 2009, a review of additional data revealed that of 3 parent permission to evaluate received during the period of August –December 2008, all 3 or 100% (3/3) met the 60-day timeline requirement. This verification of correction therefore provides the evidence of Chuuk State's subsequent correction.

As a result of the findings, Chuuk State Special Education needs to provide additional training to all special education staff and teachers on the FSM Special Education procedures to ensure consistency of the implementation of the IEP Process. Chuuk State Special Education is also required to develop and implement a weekly case review process, with technical support from the on-site consultant.

The Monitoring Team has made a determination that Chuuk State Special Education Program has not made substantial progress towards correcting this area of noncompliance and requires Chuuk State Special Education Program to take specific corrective actions. FSM National conducted five (5) on-site verification and technical assistance visits to Chuuk State within this reporting period, and has provided resources in the contracting of an on-site consultant. In addition FSM National, through a subcontract with the University of Guam CEDDERS, conducted three on-site verification visits to provide technical assistance and to monitor the progress of activities and timelines as identified in the Corrective Action Plan.

FSM will continue to closely monitor the completion of required evaluations. It is critical that Chuuk continue in its current efforts to provide the necessary training for the diagnosticians to appropriately administer the identified assessment instruments as well as to interpret the results and prepare an appropriate evaluation report.

The following describes progress made during the reporting year on the implementation of the improvement activities identified in FSM's SPP.

Improvement Activity 1: Continue implementation of the FSM-HESA *Continuous Improvement* Monitoring System, with a focus on monitoring identification percentages in the early grades, through LEA quarterly reports and fiscal reports to FSM-HESA and the FSM-HESA on-site monitoring/verification visits, as scheduled during the school year, with the implementation of focused monitoring visits for FSM states in noncompliance with this Indicator measurement.

'07-'08 Progress

FSM NDOE conducted on-site monitoring visits to all four LEAs and will continue to conduct annual monitoring visits to ensure compliance with this indicator measurement.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Corrective action plans were developed in both Chuuk and Kosrae States to track documentation requirements to ensure timelines were met. Both states met compliance for this reporting period.

Improvement Activity 2: Facilitate LEA training for staff and parents regarding the Child Find requirements for identification, referral, evaluation, and eligibility of all students with disabilities.

'07-'08 Progress: Training sessions were conducted between November 2007 to May 2008 for teachers, staff and parents on the Child Find requirements as documented in the *FSM Special Education Procedural Guidelines*. Trainings will continue annually at the LEA level.

Monitoring of the administration at the school level of *Starlin's FSM Screening and Assessment Tool*, which has been proven to be effective in potentially identifying students with disabilities, is scored, compiled and the analysis is forwarded to the Special Education Program for review.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

This is a compliance indicator, and to ensure FSM works toward meeting the requirements of this indicator, a new activity has been added. Targets are appropriate and will not be revised. FSM will continue to implement the improvement activities identified above and the new improvement activity #3 added. FSM will monitor all improvement activities on an annual basis to ensure compliance for this indicator.

New Improvement Activity 3: Yap State to develop a corrective action plan that would include training, mentoring and monitoring for appropriate implementation of *FSM Special Education Procedural Guidelines* regarding the Child Find requirements for identification, referral, evaluation, and eligibility of all students with disabilities, ensuring completion within the required 60-day timeline.

Timeline: February 15, 2009

Resources: FSM Special Education Procedural Guidelines, FSM NDOE

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: 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))

Measurement:

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	Does not apply to FSM.

Actual Target Data for FY 2007 (2007-2008):

FSM does not receive IDEA Part C funds and therefore Indicator #12 does not apply to FSM.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 for development description.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of youth aged 16 and above has an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

FSM Percent of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the child to meet the post-secondary goals for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

# of Youth with an IEP aged 16 and above	# of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the child to meet the post-secondary goals.	% of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the child to meet the post-secondary goals.
313	168	54% (168/313)

As reported by the FSM State LEAs, a total of 313 youth with an IEP aged 16 and above was served during school year 2007-2008. Of the 313, 54% (168/313) had an IEP that included coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the youth to meet post-secondary goals, demonstrating non-compliance with IDEA Part B secondary transition requirements.

A breakdown of the reported percentage by FSM State LEAs of youth with an IEP aged 16 and above that had an IEP that included coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services, is shown in the table below.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

FSM Breakdown of State LEAs Percent of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the child to meet the post-secondary goals for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

State	Number of Students with IEPs	Number with IEP (that included coordinated, measurable, and annual IEP goals and transitions services)	Percentage
Chuuk	34	32	94%
Kosrae	27	27	100%
Pohnpei	200	81	41%
Yap	52	28	54%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

For 2007-2008, FSM reported performance of 54% (168/313) for this compliance indicator, which represents a "Progress" of 22% from the reported 32% (80/251) in the previous year.

Although the three states Chuuk, Pohnpei and Yap did not meet the target of 100%, there was a significant increase in the percentage of students age 16 and above with IEPs that included transition goals and services for FFY2007. In FFY2006, Chuuk State reported 0% and this reporting period was at 94%. Pohnpei State reported an increase of 12% from FFY2006 at 29% and Yap State reported an increase of 36% for this reporting period.

OSEP Determination Letter and Response Table, June 6, 2008

In the June 2008 OSEP Response Table, OSEP noted that in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, FSM must demonstrate that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected. FSM must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable FSM to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that FSM is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements of 34 CFR §300.320(b) including reporting correction of the non compliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.

It should be noted that Indicator 15 of this APR reported Indicator 13 as a remaining noncompliance from FFY 2005. Specifically, Yap State and Pohnpei State were found to be out of compliance with the secondary transition requirements in the IEP. Therefore, FSM did not identify Indicator 13 as a finding of noncompliance for FFY 2006 because the secondary transition requirement was not corrected in FFY 2005, which require correction of the individual noncompliance and verification of correction through a review of additional data representing 100% compliance with the requirement.

The remaining noncompliance from FFY 2005 related to Indicator 13, the secondary transition requirements, for Pohnpei State and Yap State. Both Yap State and Pohnpei State were able to complete all IEPs requiring documentation of meeting the post-secondary goals and transition services requirements from FFY 2005. Chuuk State was not able to provide any data for the FFY 2005 reporting period. Chuuk State and Yap State were able to correct all individual IEPs reported in noncompliance from FFY 2006: 27 for Chuuk State and 14 for Yap State. Further, although their FFY 2007 performance didn't meet compliance for Indicator 13, progress data for Yap State and Pohnpei State were provided from September 2008-January 2009.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

As noted in the FFY 2006 APR, there were two FSM States, Pohnpei State 29% (53/183) and Yap State 18% (3/17) not meeting compliance with this indicator requirement. In response to this finding, FSM Special Education through a subcontract with the University of Hawaii, Center on Disability Studies, Pacific Outreach Initiative (UH-CDC-POI) facilitated secondary transition training in all four FSM States for secondary general and special education teachers and special education staff. The purpose of the training was to increase the knowledge and skills of participation in developing and implementing coordinated measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services to meet the post secondary goals for students with disabilities. In addition, the training session included training on the updates of the FSM Special Education Procedural Manual with revised guidelines for post-secondary outcomes that align with National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC).

Specific training was held in Yap State in February 2007. As a result of this training, Yap State Special Education corrected its FFY 2006 non-compliance issues with the completion of the 14 IEPs that included coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the child to meet the post-secondary goals.

As indicated in the FFY 2006-2007 APR, Pohnpei State was at 29% (53/183) noncompliance. To support the need to move towards compliance of this indicator, training was conducted in November 2007, for general education and special education teachers, parents, special education staff, and related service providers on IEP transition goals and services. Out of the 130 IEPs that did not have transition goals and services, Pohnpei State Special education teachers and staff held 115 IEP meetings to ensure that transition goals and services were included in the IEP. The remaining 15 IEPs are scheduled to be completed in February 2009.

Based on the table below, of the 3 high schools, 2 are at 100% compliance.

High Schools	Total Number of IEPs without transition plans reported in FFY 2006-07	Number of transition plans completed by Fall 07 & Spring 08	Percentage of IEPs completed
Madolenihmw	36	36	100%
Nanpei Memorial	25	25	100%
PICS	69	54	78%
TOTAL	130	115	88%

Teachers and staff engaged in discussion to identify reasons for non-completion of IEPs with transition goals and services. It was determined through a "drill down" method that procedures for tracking students transitioning to high school need to be consistently implemented throughout all FSM high schools.

Progress Data for Correction from September 2008 – January 2009

As of September 2008, Yap State reported that they conducted IEP meetings for the remaining 24 students ages 16 and above, including the completion of secondary transition goals and services. Therefore, Yap State is currently at 100% compliance with 52 IEPs of students age 16 and above with transition goals and service included in their IEP.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

As of January 2009, Pohnpei State reported that 185/200 (93%) IEPs for students age 16 and above with transition goals and service included in their IEP were completed. The remaining IEPs are scheduled to be completed by the end of February 2009.

FSM has determined that subsequent correction through additional data review in FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 of the FFY 2005 identified noncompliance finding was demonstrated by Yap State, but not Pohnpei State. FSM has required additional reporting of data from Pohnpei State to ensure verified correction for meeting the post-secondary goals and transition services requirements. In addition, for Chuuk State, correction was made for the FFY 2006 individual noncompliance, with monitoring of individual correction for the remaining noncompliance cases in FFY 2007.

The following describes progress on the following improvement activities:

Improvement Activity 1: By May 2007, Secondary Education Transition Procedural Handbook will be developed, with yearly updates.

'07-'08 Progress: **Completed.** Through contractual arrangements with University of Hawaii (UH)-CDC-POI, the FSM Procedural Manual was revised to include post school outcomes guidelines that are aligned with the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center.

Improvement Activity 2: By September of each year, training will be provided on the development of Individual Transition Planning Process.

'07-'08 Progress: In Fall 2007 and Spring 2008, FSM Special Education facilitated secondary transition training in all four states that included the requirement for secondary transition plans to be developed with coordinated, measurable, and annual goals and transition services. The FSM Special Education Procedural Manual was reviewed and updated.

In October 2007, Chuuk State reviewed IEPs for secondary students for procedural compliance and provided training throughout the 2007-2008 school year for secondary special education teachers on the requirements.

Improvement Activity 3: By June 2007, FSM HESA will develop and implement procedures for data collection and reporting, with annual training.

'07-'08 Progress: FSM Special Education conducted on-site training and technical assistance on the implementation of the Special Education Student Information Tracking System (SITS) on data collection procedures and updated data elements related to secondary transition requirements.

Improvement Activity 4: On a yearly basis, on-site technical assistance will be provided in two of the states for Special Education Coordinators, Regular Education Administrators, Secondary Transition Teachers,

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Parents, Consumer/Student Trainees, College representatives, Chamber of Commerce representatives, Business Organizations, and others.

'07-'08 Progress:

On-site technical assistance and training was conducted in the four State LEAs through a subcontract with UOH-PIO on secondary transition guidelines and strategies to ensure coordinated, measurable, IEP goals and transition services.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/ Timelines/ Resources for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

This is a compliance indicator, therefore based on stakeholder input, the following improvement activity was recommended to ensure compliance with this indicator. Targets are appropriate and will not be revised. FSM will continue to implement the improvement activities identified above and monitor on an annual basis. FSM looks forward to OSEP's approval of this new improvement activity.

Improvement Activity 5: Training on the new *FSM Special Education Transition Manual* procedures for transitioning and tracking students from 8th grade elementary to high school.

Timeline: Annually

Resources: Special Education Transition staff, Support from FSM NDOE

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.

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

Measurement:
 Percent = # of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school divided by # of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	63% of youth who had IEPs are not longer in secondary school and who are competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school in 2006-2007

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

As per Table 618 Data Table 15 noted below, there were 48 students that were no longer in secondary schools for FFY 2006-2007.

Exit Data: Reasons and Percent for FFY 2006-2007

State	Graduated with a regular diploma	Dropped Out	# Leavers
Chuuk	6	1	7
Kosrae	6	7	13
Pohnpei	14	6	20
Yap	7	1	8
Total FSM	69% (33/48)	31% (15/48)	48

(Table 15 – Exit Report, ages 14-21, July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)

FSM exceeded the target for this indicator at 75% (36/48) of the 2006-2007 “leavers” as being competitively employed and/or participating in post-secondary education. The following table describes students who, as of June 2008, are no longer in school, competitively employed or enrolled in post secondary school or training, or both.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Measurement Table: 2006-2007 Secondary Students with an IEP who Exited School:

State	b. # of Leavers	a. # of youth who are no longer in secondary school who have been competitively employed, enrolled in postsecondary school		Other		
		Employment	Post Secondary	Cultural	Self Employed	Unknown
Chuuk	7	3	3	1	-	-
Kosrae	13	4	6		1	2
Pohnpei	20	--	18	-	-	2
Yap	8	1	1	6	-	-
FSM	48	36/48x 100 = 75%		12/48 = 25%		

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FY 2007 (2007-2008):

As noted in the first table above, there were 48 leavers as of FFY 2005-2006. Of the 48 leavers, 8 (17%) are competitively employed and 28 (58%) are in post secondary schools. The seven individuals under the category “cultural” are reported to be working in their families’ taro patch or fishing as a means of supporting the family and is an acceptable and common practice.

The following are progress updates to the improvement activities;

Improvement Activity 1: Implementation of a post secondary school outcomes guideline and measurement tool to support data tracking system on the transition plans developed for secondary students with IEPs. The data will be analyzed to determine the relationship between the post-secondary goals with the post-school outcomes, which would assist FSM NDOE to identify relevant post-school outcomes meaningful in the FSM.

07'- 08' Progress: In November and December 2007, FSM Special Education facilitated training in collaboration with the University of Hawaii Pacific Outreach Initiative (POI) on secondary special education and transition services. In addition, further training was conducted for secondary teachers on the FSM Special Education Procedural Manual that incorporated the development of secondary transition goals and objectives.

Improvement Activity 2: Review, revise as needed, and provide training to special education staff on the procedures and guidelines (Activity #1) for collecting, compiling, reporting, and verifying post-school outcomes data.

07'- 08' Progress: Annual training was held during the Special Education Coordinators Meeting on April 12, 2008 on the FSM Special Education Procedural Guidelines which defines “drop out” and procedures to ensuring that IEP exit meetings are held. The FSM Special Education Procedural Guidelines clearly defines

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

procedures for maintaining and reporting students with IEPs that drop-out.

With the implementation of the Student Information Tracking System (SITS), tracking of students with IEPs in high school is improved through specific exit data which is generated by SITS with updated demographic and contact information. In addition, State visits were conducted to provide on-site technical assistance and training for each State's Special Education Coordinator, Data Manager, and Data Technician on verification of using the SITS data and strategies to compile individual state reporting requirements.

Improvement Activity 3: Training for secondary special education and general education teachers on topical area strategies that enhance the transition planning and supports for secondary students with IEPs.

07'- 08' Progress: Refer to Improvement Activity 1 and 2.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

This is a compliance indicator therefore targets will not be adjusted. FSM will continue to implement the improvement activities and monitor on an annual basis. Therefore, no additional improvement activities are needed.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

Measurement:
 Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and enforcement actions that the State has taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects all noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification 100% of the time.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

As a unitary system, FSM receives IDEA Part B funds to support the delivery of special education and related services in the FSM. Given the geographic and governmental structure of the FSM, FSM has established a State Education Agency (SEA) and Local Education Agency (LEA) system for delivering and monitoring special education and related services in the FSM.

FSM National Department of Education (NDOE), serving as the State Education Agency (SEA), assumes the general supervision responsibilities for facilitating the delivery of special education and related services in the four FSM island states through their Education Departments, known as the Local Education Agencies (LEAs): Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap. To meet its general supervision responsibilities, FSM has a monitoring system, the *Continuous Improvement* Monitoring System, to assess compliance and performance with the IDEA Part B requirements. The system components include data system reviews, LEA quarterly progress reports, LEA Local Performance Plans (LPPs), and annual on-site monitoring/verification visits.

For FFY 2007, FSM utilized the following OSEP B15 worksheet to document the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006. As noted in OSEP’s September 2008 guidance, “for the purposes of the SPP/APR reporting, timely correction occurs when noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible but no later than one year from the identification of noncompliance.” Verification of correction was done through additional data review specific to the

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

noncompliance. An explanation of each verified correction is provided after the OSEP B15 worksheet.

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified (ID) in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from ID
		N/A=Not Applicable (No Finding Related to Indicator)		
1. Graduation Rates	Monitoring Activities: Monitoring, Data Review	N/A	N/A	N/A
2. Drop-Out Rates		Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	N/A	N/A
14. Post-School Outcomes	Monitoring Activities: Monitoring, Data Review	N/A	N/A	N/A
3. State-wide Assessment	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	N/A	N/A	N/A
7. Preschool Outcomes	Monitoring Activities: Monitoring, Data Review	N/A	N/A	N/A
4A. Long-term suspension & expulsion rates	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	N/A	N/A	N/A
5. School-Age LRE	Monitoring Activities: Monitoring, Data Review	4	7	5
6. Preschool LRE	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	N/A	N/A	N/A
8. Parent Involvement	Monitoring Activities: Monitoring, Data Review	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	N/A	N/A	N/A
9. 9. Disproportionality	Monitoring Activities: Monitoring, Data Review	Not Applicable to FSM.		
10. Disproportionality	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
11. 60-Timeline Requirement (Receipt of parent permission to evaluation completed)	Monitoring Activities: Monitoring, Data Review	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	N/A	N/A	N/A
12. IEP in Effect by 3 rd Birthday (Transition from Part C to Part B)	Monitoring Activities: Monitoring, Data Review	Not Applicable to FSM.		

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(a)	(b)
			# of Findings of noncompliance identified (ID) in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	# of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from ID
		N/A=Not Applicable (No Finding Related to Indicator)		
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
13. Postsecondary Goals and Transition Services	Monitoring Activities: Monitoring, Data Review	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other areas of noncompliance: Interagency Agreement	Monitoring Activities: Monitoring, Data Review	1	1	1
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			8	6
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.			(b) / (a) X 100 =	75%

Explanation of Verified Correction (b)

In FFY 2006, FSM did not receive any formal complaints or hearing requests. FSM identified findings of noncompliance in FFY 2006 through on-site monitoring visits and data review for each LEA. Explanation of verified correction of the FFY 2006 findings of noncompliance as follows:

- **Indicator 5:** 71% (5/7) Verified Correction for this Indicator:
 - **Annual IEP Review** requirements were not met for all children with IEPs in all four FSM States or LEAs. As documented in the FFY 2007 FSM Monitoring Reports, Kosrae State and Yap State, 2 of the 4 LEAs, met the correction requirement for this noncompliance finding.
 - Documented descriptions of the **Continuum of Alternative Placements** were not in place in 3 of the 4 LEAs: Kosrae State, Pohnpei State, Yap State. During the FFY 2007 FSM on-site monitoring visits, evidence was provided by all 3 LEAs of having a description of the Continuum of Alternative Placements.
- **Other:** 100% (1/1) Verified Correction for this Other Area:
 - An **Interagency Agreement** was not in effect in 1 of the 4 LEAs: Chuuk State. The FFY 2007 FSM Monitoring Report indicated correction of this noncompliance.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

FSM reported 75% (6/8) performance in FFY 2007, which represents progress from last year's performance of 50% (1/2) for this compliance indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

June 2008 OSEP Response Table: Outstanding Noncompliance from FFY 2006 APR

In FFY 2006, FSM determined that 2 of the 4 LEAs-Chuuk State and Kosrae State-did not correct the finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to meeting the 60-day timeline requirement (Indicator 11). As discussed in Indicator 11, FSM reports subsequent correction for this requirement through evidence that the individual student evaluations reported in FFY 2005 have been completed and a review of at least 3 months of additional data for each LEA demonstrated 100% compliance with meeting the 60-day timeline requirement.

Chuuk State: FSM has increased monitoring of services and provided additional technical support for improving services, especially as a result of OSEP on-site verification visit in October 2006. In July 2008, FSM provided OSEP the final report for OSEP's Verification Letter dated July 2007 acknowledging the challenges for meeting the 60-day timeline. Specific actions were developed and implemented to meet this compliance requirement. Chuuk was able to demonstrate that all 52 evaluations overdue in FFY 2006 have all been completed. Progress data has been provided for Chuuk State related to the 60-day timeline requirement. An on-site verification visit was conducted January 28-30, 2009, a review of additional data revealed that of 3 parent permission to evaluate received during the period of August –December 2008, all 3 or 100% (3/3) met the 60-day timeline requirement. This verification of correction therefore provides the evidence of Chuuk State's subsequent correction.

Kosrae State: Based on the Monitoring report for Kosrae State for FFY 2007-08, Kosrae State received 19 referrals; of which 1 (5%) was completed within the 60-day timeline. As a result, the Monitoring Team made the determination that Kosrae State Special Education Program continues to be in a Needs Assistance level. On May 12, 2008, Kosrae State Special Education submitted a quarterly progress report to FSM documenting completion of the 18 remaining evaluations. The report also stated that of the 53 students referred for special education services in FFY2007, 35 (66%) evaluations were completed within the 60-day timeline, showing progress towards compliance. In addition, the report showed completion of the 37% (21/57) over due evaluations from FFY 2006. Further, Kosrae State reported progress data from July 2008 to September 2008. Of 10 referrals with consent to evaluate, all 10 were completed and determined eligible within the 60-day timeline. This verification of correction therefore provides the evidence of Kosrae State's subsequent correction.

June 2008 OSEP Response Table: Remaining Noncompliance from FFY 2005 APR

The remaining noncompliance from FFY 2005 related to Indicator 13, the secondary transition requirements, for Pohnpei State and Yap State. As discussed in Indicator 13, both Yap State and Pohnpei State were able to complete all IEPs requiring documentation of meeting the post-secondary goals and transition services requirements from FFY 2005. **Chuuk State was not able to provide any data for the FFY 2005 reporting period. Chuuk State and Yap State were able to correct all individual IEPs reported in noncompliance from FFY 2006: 27 for Chuuk State and 14 for Yap State. Further, although their FFY 2007 performance didn't meet compliance for Indicator 13, progress data for Yap State and Pohnpei State were provided from September 2008-January 2009.** For Yap State, all youth with IEPs had the required post secondary goals and transition services in their IEP, demonstrating 100% compliance as of January 2009.

For Pohnpei State, a "drill down" was conducted to determine the root cause for the noncompliance. Pohnpei State determined that there wasn't consistency in tracking students from elementary to high school, in particular at PICS High School. As of January 2009, Pohnpei State reported that 185/200 (93%) IEPs for students age 16 and above with transition goals and

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

service included in their IEP were completed. The remaining IEPs are scheduled to be completed by the end of February 2009.

FSM has determined that subsequent correction through additional data review in FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 of the FFY 2005 identified noncompliance finding was demonstrated by Yap State, but not Pohnpei State. FSM has required additional reporting of data from Pohnpei State to ensure verified correction for meeting the post-secondary goals and transition services requirements. In addition, for Chuuk State, correction was made for the FFY 2006 individual noncompliance, with monitoring of individual correction for the remaining noncompliance cases in FFY 2007.

July 2008 FSM Final Report in Response to OSEP's July 2007 Verification Letter: Progress Data

As a follow-up to the FSM July 2008 Final Report to OSEP, FSM provides **Attachments 1-4** of this APR as progress data for the noncompliance identified in OSEP's July 2007 Verification Letter. Specific Reporting includes:

Attachment 1

- Chuuk State Child Identification includes "intakes" designed to gather screening data for children having academic or functional difficulties who might require a referral for special education and related services. These "intakes" are intended to be reviewed during the weekly case review process for determining required actions, such as gathering additional data or providing additional general education intervention prior to a referral to obtain parent permission to evaluate. (refer to Attachment 1 for further discussion and updated data)
- Chuuk State demonstrates progress with addressing the LRE requirements and the continuum of alternative placements, as outlined in the FSM Handbook for Special Education. Attachment 1 provides an update of the IEP file reviews for this requirement.

Attachment 2

- Sufficient homebound teachers to provide needed academic services in Chuuk State. As listed in Attachment 2, Chuuk State has 8 homebound teachers and related services assistants who provide home services to 65 children with disabilities requiring home services. The home services caseload ranges from 5 to 10 children per assigned personnel. As noted, there is evidence of academic instruction in the IEPs and the documentation of the home visits indicates that home services are provided in accordance with the IEP.
- As reported, at the beginning of school year 2007-2008, transportation for children with IEPs are being provided through the use of vehicles and boats for the outer islands.

Attachment 3

- Provides an update on the random file reviews conducted in Chuuk State for evaluation and IEP completeness.

Attachment 4

- Provides an update on the revisions to the National Interagency Agreement and the FSM Fiscal Management Training

FSM Continuous Improvement Monitoring System

Beginning in FFY 2006, FSM has been able to conduct a FSM On-site Monitoring visit to all four LEAs, as compared to previous years. This is significant improvement in the overall general

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

supervision system, especially with the challenges of communication and travel to and from each LEA (only via plane and ship travel). As described in previous reports, FSM provides special education and related services in four unique, rural, and remote areas in the Western Pacific. With the exception of Pohnpei State where the FSM National Government resides, FSM National personnel must travel through air or ship to the other three FSM States.

The FSM *Continuous Improvement* Monitoring System assesses compliance and performance of each LEA based on the IDEA 2004 State Performance Plan (SPP), 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. The FSM LEA Special Education Coordinators and staff have been provided orientation on the monitoring system as a preparation activity prior to FSM conducting an on-site monitoring visit.

As part of the overall general supervision requirements, FSM required each LEA to submit an annual LEA application for IDEA Part B funding, which includes:

- The LEA Local Performance Plan (LPP) that details accomplishments for the previous school year and proposed targets and improvement plans and priorities for the coming school year that align with the OSEP approved December 2005 FSM SPP (first submission was for the 2005-2006 reporting period). The LPP is designed as a local level annual performance plan that incorporates the quarterly reports from the previous year;
- A detailed budget description of how Part B funds will be used to ensure all eligible students with disabilities are provided with free appropriate public education (first submission for FFY 2006 budget year); and
- Assurance statements documenting the LEA's commitment to implementing the IDEA Part B requirements (first submission for FFY 2006 budget year).

FFY 2007 represented the third year of implementation of the annual LEA application for IDEA Part B funding.

In January 2007, the FSM *Continuous Improvement* Monitoring System was updated to include "determination levels" following OSEP's determination levels: Meets requirements, needs assistance, needs intervention, and needs substantial intervention. These levels, with appropriate consequences and sanctions, were used as a result of an on-site monitoring visit and review of the FSM State annual Local Performance Plan (LPP) beginning 2006-2007. In FFY 2007, 3 of the 4 FSM States or LEAs were given the determination level of "needs assistance"; while the 4th LEA (Chuuk State) remained in "needs intervention."

FSM has demonstrated significant progress in verifying timely correction of noncompliance in each FSM state. Incorporated into the process for the "determination levels" was a review of evidence of the FSM state's timely correction of noncompliance, which has been defined in the FSM *Continuous Improvement* Monitoring System as "as soon as possible, but not later than one year from the date that FSM NDOE identifies the noncompliance."

OSEP's September 2008 clarification regarding identification of findings and the required verification of correction processes provide further guidance for how FSM will refine its general supervision system and reporting for this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement
Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):**

FFY 2007 represents the third year of implementation with the revised monitoring system, which includes the LEA LPP development process as one of the components of the general supervision system. While improvement still needs to be made in relation to the timely submission of the LEA LPPs, this year's submission have demonstrated greater accuracy and connection between performance data and associated improvement activities. Further, OSEP's September 2008 clarification regarding identification of findings and the required verification of correction processes will assist with refining FSM's monitoring system. This will not require specific new improvement activities at this time.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

No signed written complaints received for this reporting period. (Refer to Table 7 attached)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

No due process hearing requests received for this reporting period. (Refer to Table 7 attached)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: 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)))

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	Unable to set target. No requests received. As per OSEP's instructions, targets are set with 10 or more hearing resolutions as baseline.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

No due process hearing requests received for this reporting period. (Refer to Table 7 attached)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY (2007-2008):

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2008-2009:

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Measurement:

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	Unable to set target. No requests received. As per OSEP's instructions, targets are set with 10 or more mediations as baseline.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

No due process hearing requests or mediation requests received for this reporting period. As per OSEP's instructions, targets are required only if a baseline of at least 10 mediations have been established. Refer to Table 7 attached.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

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

Measurement:
 State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

FSM worked toward the 100% target for the timely and accurate reporting of 618 and SPP and APR data. 7 618 data reports and 1 SPP/APR of 20 indicators and 20 total measurement items. For this reporting period, FSM used the revised SPP/APR Data rubric recommended by OSEP.

For Measurement A: FSM is required to complete and submit all 7 data reports (618 data reports 1-7). APR Indicators 3A, 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to FSM; thus, 8 cells do not apply to the FSM and the APR denominator is 35 instead of 43.

For Measurement B: FSM uses OSEP’s rubric to calculate the accuracy of its data submission. In addition, outcomes of the 7 data reports and the SPP/APR submissions are reflected in the rubric.

As shown in OSEP’s rubric below, FSM’s overall performance for this reporting year of 91% did not meet this compliance indicator.

Part B Indicator 20 - SPP/APR Data			
APR Indicator	Valid and reliable	Correct calculation	Total
1	1		1
2	1		1
3A	N/A	N/A	0
3B	1	1	2
3C	1	1	2
4A	1	1	2

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

5	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8	1	1	2
9	N/A	N/A	0
10	N/A	N/A	0
11	1	1	2
12	N/A	N/A	0
13	1	1	2
14	1	1	2
15	1	1	2
16	1	1	2
17	1	1	2
18	1	1	2
19	1	1	2
		Subtotal	30
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points (5 pts for submission of APR/SPP by February 2, 2009)		5
	Grand Total		35

Part B Indicator 20 - 618 Data					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Date Note Requests	Total
Table 1 – Child Count Due Date: 2/1/08	1	1	0	1	3
Table 2 – Personnel Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 3 – Ed. Environments Due Date: 2/1/08	1	1	1	1	4
Table 4 – Exiting Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 5 – Discipline Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 6 – State Assessment Due Date: 2/1/08	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
Table 7 – Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	1	N/A	3
				Subtotal	20
Weighted Total (subtotal X 1.87; round ≤.49 down and ≥ .50 up to whole number)					37
Indicator #20 Calculation					
			A. APR Total	35	
			B. 618 Total	37	
			C. Grand Total	72	
Percent of timely and accurate data = [C divided by (82-8(N/A in APR)) times 100]			(72) / (74) X 100 =		97%

NOTE: 618 Table 5: FSM requests OSEP to not penalize FSM for "complete data and passed edit check" for the following reasons:

- **FSM did accurately report expulsion data for eligible students with disabilities in Table 5.**

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

- FSM did not report expulsion data for general education students as this data is not currently required to be reported in the FSM by general education. The Special Education program is working closely with general education to remedy this for the next reporting period.
- FSM anticipates that all required data for Table 5 will be collected and reported for the FFY 09 APR.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

For this reporting period, FSM collected data reports from the four LEAs for purposes of monitoring of progresses at the local level school programs and to report progresses thereof to OSEP as required. Data reports for the completion of the FSM 2007-2008 APR/SPP and 618 Table 1 (07-08 Child count), Table 2 (07-08 Personnel), Table 3 (07-08 Environment), Table 4 (07-08 Exiting), Table 5 (07-08 Discipline), Table 6 (07-08 Assessment), and Table 7 (07-08 Dispute Resolution) are used to determine timeliness and accuracy of data collection and reporting.

The FSM demonstrated substantial improvement in the timely and accurate submission of all required data reports related to 618 Tables and SPP Indicators. However, it should be noted that the denominator used to determine performance for this report is different than that of FFY 2006 APR.

FSM DOE continues to work to improve the data systems necessary to report data from its LEAs to the SEA level on a timely and accurate basis which can also be verified. FSM completed an updated version of its Student Information Tracking System (SITS) which include features allowing for 618 data reports, Indicator measurement reporting, case management tracking and reporting, and assessment data reporting.

State on-site visits have been scheduled for training on the updated SITS version and to offer technical assistance to state data managers and staffs. The outcomes of these on-site trainings will be reported in the next SPP/APR.

The hiring of a new FSM National Special Education Data/Assessment Coordinator will further ensure that the SITS is interfaced with the new FSM National Department of Education website at www.fsmed.fm. Special Education APR/SPP and related reports can now be viewed at this new FSM Department of Education website.

While FSM's data continued to indicate noncompliance with the requirements in IDEA section 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b), substantial improvement has occurred during this reporting period. For this reporting period, all 7 618 data reports were submitted timely. Further, the SITS had been upgraded to include required data elements allow for timely access to LEA data reports.

Improvement Activity 1: Finalize upgrade of SITS database to include required new data elements for collection and reporting and finalization of User Manual and System Documentation by March 2008.

'07-'08 Progress: Activity completed. Updated version installed in all states by Data/Assessment Coordinator from August 15 thru 24, 2007. An

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

additional on-site visit to Chuuk was completed from April 1-3, 2008.

Improvement Activity 2: Reinstall as necessary and provide on-site training on data entry and verification that data is being entered accurately by April 2008.

'07-'08 Progress: Current version of SITS was reinstalled at all states and further testing were conducted. For Chuuk State, an on-site visit was conducted April 1-3, 2008, to reinstall and provide technical assistance on the use and maintenance of the database.

Improvement Activity 3: Revise and implement data collection procedures to align with SITS for all other required data elements that are not tied to individual student records by April 2008

'07-'08 Progress: Activity completed.

Improvement Activity 4: Review the accuracy of and update existing special education student records to ensure all data are accurate prior to entering into SITS database by June 2008.

'07-'08 Progress: All four states have the updated version of SITS reinstalled in their computer systems. States were required to continue extensive reviews of student IEPs to ensure their completeness and accuracy before input into the system.

Improvement Activity 5: Review overall stability and accuracy of SITS database and examine feasibility of integrating SITS within overall FSM National Department of Education-Education Information Management System (EIMS) by September 2008.

'07-'08 Progress: This activity is ongoing because the FSM EIMS has not been finalized with links to SITS. A related accomplishment is the FSM National Department of Education launched its website (www.fsmed.fm) and Special Education reports and related documents are available for viewing on the website.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

This is a compliance indicator, therefore targets are appropriate and will not be revised. FSM will continue to implement the improvement activities above to ensure compliance with this indicator requirement.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

ATTACHMENT 1: PROGRESS DATA

July 2008 FSM Final Report as required in OSEP FSM Verification Letter, July 17, 2007

Description of Noncompliance Findings/Required Actions in OSEP FSM Verification Letter, July 17, 2007	
<p>A. <u>CHUUK</u> (OSEP Verification Letter, pages 4-5 & 15)</p> <p>(1) all children with disabilities who are in need of special education and related services are identified, located, evaluated and provided appropriate placements based on their special education needs as required at 34CFR 300.111;</p> <p>(2) to the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities are educated with children who are not disabled, and special education classes, separate schooling, or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily (34 CFR 300.114); and</p> <p>(3) a continuum of alternative placements is available to meet the needs of children with disabilities for special education and related services as required by 34 CFR 300.115, and ensuring that placement decisions are made pursuant to 34 CFR 300.116.</p>	
Required Reporting & Timeline	
<p>In the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008, FSM must provide OSEP with documentation of the correction of FSM identified noncompliance in Chuuk and demonstrate that the correction was timely (i.e. corrections were made by September 19, 2007). In addition, Need to explain how Chuuk is demonstrating compliance – What would determine compliance? What is the evidence? For example, for Child Find, with consideration of the implementation of the plan, what immediate results have been seen, especially in the main island of Weno, and what are the benchmarks for addressing the outer island Child Find needs – Awareness campaign, etc.</p>	
FSM Report Submissions	OSEP Response
<p><u>February 2008</u>: FSM provided progress data within FSM's FFY 2006 APR submitted to OSEP February 1, 2008.</p> <p><u>July 2008</u>: FSM submitted its Final Report to OSEP.</p>	<p><u>June 2008</u>: In response to FSM's FFY 2006 APR submitted February 1, 2008, OSEP provided the following response to the progress report submitted as Attachment 1 to the APR: <i>FSM reported that the area of noncompliance specific to preschool LRE has been corrected in a timely manner and provided information on progress in the other areas. In the final report due July 17, 2008, FSM must provide documentation of the correction of the other areas of noncompliance as noted above, with respect to children with disabilities in Chuuk who are not in preschool and children on the outer islands. (OSEP's finding was not limited to preschool children.)</i></p> <p><u>August 2008</u>: In consultation with OSEP, FSM submits progress data in its FFY 2007 APR due to OSEP by February 2, 2009.</p>
PROGRESS DATA AS OF JANUARY 2009	
<p>1. Child Identification: Status in July 2008: With the August 2008 completion of the Child Find outreach activities, evidence of actions required for all pending intake forms will be completed by September 2008. This will be achieved through documentation of the weekly case review process, with FSM's review of Chuuk State's monthly reports. It is anticipated that with the monthly reporting of progress to FSM and the Chuuk State Special Education Advisory Panel, additional collaborative efforts between Health Services and special education will occur in conducting outreach activities.</p> <p>a. <u>As of January 2009</u>: FSM provided on-site technical support during the week of July 21, 2008 for the Child Find outreach activities. Pohnpei State special education personnel were also on-site to provide technical support with POSCA (parent organization) and Health Services.</p>	

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

PROGRESS DATA AS OF JANUARY 2009

Given the geographic distance from one island to another, the Child Find outreach activities extended beyond the week of July 21st. During November 10-21, 2008, Child Find/screening activities occurred in the main island as well as the outer lagoon islands.

From the FSM on-site verification visit held in January 2009, the number of intakes received and actions taken compiled by Chuuk as follows:

Intakes for Special Education Services from July 2008 to December 2008:

Region	#Intakes	#Intakes Required Referral and Parent Permission to Evaluate	#Parent Permission Received and Evaluation Completed	#Intakes Pending Action
NN	4	3	3	1
SN	73	0	0	73
FK	24	0	0	24
MK	4	0	0	4
NW	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	105	3	3	102

As listed in the Table above, actions have not been taken for the majority of the intakes. Of the 105 Intakes, 3% (3/105) have been addressed through the "action" of referral and obtaining parent permission to evaluation with completion of the evaluation within the 60-day timeline. The weekly case management review has not been consistently conducted, especially with the follow-up Child Find activity held in November 2008. This weekly review is critical, especially with screening those kids who are already receiving special education services. It was discovered in previous activities that children with IEPs make it to the activities and family sign them in for the screening. Although the weekly case management review has not been consistently implemented, Chuuk State showed evidence of the ability to track these "intakes" from their database system. Within Chuuk's revised plan, actions to be taken for these pending intakes will be completed by May 2009.

2. **Meeting LRE Requirements, including the Continuum of Placements:** Status in July 2008: Review of compliance with Part B LRE requirements was included in the review of IEPs in July 2008. Through a random review of files, FSM determined that 60% (6/10) of the IEPs included the required LRE justification for the IEP team placement decision.
 - a. **As of January 2009:** During the January 2009 on-site verification visit to Chuuk State, a random file review was conducted revealing that 80% (8/10) met the LRE requirements in the IEP. This shows improvement from 60% in July 2008 to 80% (8/10) in January 2009.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

ATTACHMENT 2: PROGRESS DATA

July 2008 FSM Final Report as required in OSEP FSM Verification Letter, July 17, 2007

Description of Noncompliance Findings/Required Actions in OSEP FSM Verification Letter, July 17, 2007	
<p>B. CHUUK (pages 5-7 & 15)</p> <p>(1) Chuuk's implementation of FSM's procedures for providing FAPE to all children with disabilities as required by 34 CFR 300.101(a);</p> <p>(2) children with disabilities who are homebound have an IEP in accordance with the requirements at 34 CFR 300.320 through 300.328, including that IEPs in clued a statement of a child's academic goals as required by 34 CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i) and a statement of the special education and related services to be provided to the child as required by 34 CFR 300.320(a)(4);</p> <p>(3) there are sufficient homebound teachers to provide needed academic services as required by 34 CFR 300.101(a), 300.323(c) and 300.156; and</p> <p>(4) transportation services are provided to all children with disabilities who require such services to benefit from special education as required by 34 CFR 300.17, 300.34(a), and 300.34(c)(16), and 300.101(a).</p>	
Required Reporting & Timeline	
<p>FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008, a report demonstrating compliance of the OSEP identified areas or a report of FSM's progress in correcting identified noncompliance in Chuuk. <u>Within one year of the date of this letter</u>, FSM must provide OSEP with data and information demonstrating correction of the OSEP identified areas of noncompliance in Chuuk.</p>	
FSM Report Submissions	OSEP Response
<p><u>February 2008</u>: FSM provided progress data within FSM's FFY 2006 APR submitted to OSEP Feb 1, 2008.</p> <p><u>July 2008</u>: FSM submitted its Final Report to OSEP.</p>	<p><u>June 2008</u>: FSM provided a progress report addressing these areas of noncompliance, and reported that it will submit a final report demonstrating compliance with these requirements by July 17, 2008.</p> <p><u>August 2008</u>: In consultation with OSEP, FSM submits progress data in its FFY 2007 APR due to OSEP by February 2, 2009.</p>

PROGRESS DATA AS OF JANUARY 2009

<p>1. <u>FSM's Procedures for Providing FAPE (34CFR 300.101a)</u>: Status in July 2008: The on-site consultant hired in December 2007 provided technical support to the special education administrators and staff on the implementation of the FAPE requirements following the FSM handbook procedures. The corrective action of implementing a weekly case review process would provide the additional technical support for reviewing the documentation required for each step of the process.</p> <p>a. <u>As of January 2009</u>: Refer to Attachment 1 for progress on the <u>Child Find</u> efforts throughout Chuuk State that make available FAPE to all children with disabilities.</p>
<p>2. <u>Home Services Provided to Children with Disabilities who are Homebound (34CFR 300.320-300.328, 300.320(a)(2)(i), and 300.320(a)(4))</u>: Status in July 2008: A review of sample IEPs of children with disabilities receiving home services revealed evidence of a few academic goals. As a result of the visit, additional training was requested for the homebound teachers and related service assistants to understand the provisions for developing appropriate statements of measurable annual goals, including academic and functional goals (34CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i)).</p> <p>a. <u>As of January 2009</u>: During the on-site verification visit in January 2009, FSM interviewed one of the regional supervisors regarding the delivery of home services. As reported, the Home Service Delivery Monthly Report Form is completed. Based on the child record review of 3 children with IEPs who receive special education and related services in the home, academic goals and frequency of instruction/visits</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

PROGRESS DATA AS OF JANUARY 2009

were listed. However, verification with the completed home service provider report form not some discrepancy in the frequency of visits.

- 3. Sufficient Homebound Teachers (34CFR 300.101(a), 300.323(c), and 300.156): Status in July 2008: Chuuk State implemented a Homebound Service Verification Form for home service providers to have families sign off. The purpose for the form was to verify the required home services with the actual services delivered to determine whether there were sufficient homebound teachers and related service assistants to provide home services based on the IEPs. The form is being improved to track the frequency of services that are provided based upon each child's IEP.

a. As of January 2009: During the on-site verification visit in January 2009, FSM reviewed the revisions to the Home Service Verification Form. It included the specifics needed for tracking frequency of services based on the child's IEP. The supervisors will be monitoring closely the use of the form. To date, the number of personnel who provide home services 8 related service assistants/home service teachers. With a total of 65 children with disabilities requiring home services, the range of caseload for these personnel is from 5 students with IEPs to 10 students with IEPs for an average home service caseload of 8 students with IEPs for each related service assistant/home services teacher.

- 4. Transportation Services (34CFR 300.17, 300.34(a), 300.34(c)(16), and 300.101(a)): Status in July 2008: Chuuk State developed and submitted guidelines for transportation services. FSM required Chuuk State to develop written Standard Operating Procedures to account for vehicles and boats assigned to special education being utilized for official purposes only. Furthermore, only certain individuals are permitted to draw down fuel.

a. As of January 2009: During the on-site verification visit in January 2009, FSM met with the Chuuk State Education Department account assigned to handle all IDEA Part B funds. As reported, a procedure was established and initiated in September 2008 for releasing gasoline vouchers. The process includes:

- 1. If gasoline is needed for school supplies, a request is made to the Special Education (SpEd) Coordinator
2. Request from the SpEd Coordinator for gasoline is sent to the Ed- Business office to process the authorization
3. Ed Business Office completes an AUTHORIZATION (with approval of Director of ED) for gasoline to a certain vendor
4. SpEd staff are authorized to get the gasoline and returns the gas receipts to Ed Business office
5. Ed Business office verifies the receipt and forwards to National Business office to pay the vendor

NOTE: Based on interviews with SpEd staff, there has not been an issue with the gasoline voucher process.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

ATTACHMENT 3: PROGRESS DATA

July 2008 FSM Final Report as required in OSEP FSM Verification Letter, July 17, 2007

Description of Noncompliance Findings/Required Actions in OSEP FSM Verification Letter, July 17, 2007	
C. CHUUK (pages 7-8 & 16) (5) Review with special education staff in Chuuk all existing IEPs to ensure that they are developed in accordance with Part B requirements at 34 CFR 300.320 through 300.328 and evaluations have been completed in accordance with the requirements at 34 CFR 300.301 through 300.311.	
Required Reporting & Timeline	
FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008, FSM-HESA's report should document the number of IEPs reviewed, the results of the review, and whether any changes were made to the IEPs as a result of the reviews. The report should also include the number of evaluations reviewed, the results of the review, and what steps FSM took as a result of the reviews.	
FSM Report Submissions	OSEP Response
February 2008: FSM provided progress data within FSM's FFY 2006 APR submitted to OSEP February 1, 2008. July 2008: FSM submitted its Final Report to OSEP.	June 2008: FSM reported that all existing IEPs in Chuuk were reviewed and evaluated, and that changes were being made to IEPs for high school students to include transition services. However, FSM did not provide: (a) the number of IEPs that were evaluated, the results of the review, and the steps that were taken as a result of the review; and (b) the number of evaluations of children that were reviewed, the results of the review, and (c) what steps FSM took as a result of the review. FSM must provide this information to OSEP in its final report-7/17/08. August 2008: In consultation with OSEP, FSM submits progress data in its FFY 2007 APR due to OSEP by February 2, 2009.
PROGRESS DATA AS OF JANUARY 2009	
<p>1. IEP Reviews: Status in July 2008: To verify the IEPs for completeness, a random sample of the files inputted into the FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS) data system was reviewed. From the 108 list of students in the FSM SITS, 10 files were pulled for review. It should be noted that Chuuk State serves more than 108 students with IEPs. Chuuk has been maintaining an excel data system until all student data have been inputted into the FSM SITS. FSM had to provide on-site technical support for the SITS in April 2008 to address software technical issues. The 108 therefore represented Chuuk State's verified "entered" data after several months of difficulty with the input system. Using the <i>FSM Continuous Improvement Monitoring System</i> Child Record Review checklist, the IEP file review revealed that 70% (7/10) included current IEPs. However, only 10% (1/10) included all the IEP required documentation. In some forms, the missing information was something that was not checked off. This level of document verification serves to both clarify the correct manner in which IEPs are to be developed and to reinforce to Chuuk State that the identified deficiencies must be corrected. FSM will continue to conduct on-site visits to verify and provide additional training to ensure Chuuk State has the capacity to meet all requirements.</p> <p>a. As of January 2009: Refer to discussion in Indicator 20 of the APR regarding the FSM SITS. During the on-site verification visit in January 2009, FSM randomly reviewed IEP files for completeness, similar to what was done in July 2008. All 10 IEP files reviewed were current; however, none included all the components required in an IEP. IEP components that were evident in the files included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. 100% (10/10) included the required meeting notice ii. 70% (7/10) documented that the parents were in attendance iii. 100% (10/10) included the required IEP service descriptions iv. 80% (8/10) included the required LRE justification (NOTE: An improvement from July 2008's review of 60% (6/10) with the required LRE justification) <p>2. Completion of Evaluations (34 CFR 300.301 through 300.311): Status in July 2008: Documents reviewed during the July 7-8 on-site visit included the Evaluation schedule developed by the diagnosticians, a sample review of the recently administered Brigance, the SITS data system records, a sample review of IEPs from the files entered into the SITS data system, and the revised Quarterly Report submitted to NDOE the week of June 30-July 4, 2008.</p> <p>a. As of January 2009: Refer to discussion in Indicator 11 of the APR regarding Chuuk State's progress on meeting the evaluation requirements.</p>	

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

ATTACHMENT 4: PROGRESS DATA

July 2008 FSM Final Report as required in OSEP FSM Verification Letter, July 17, 2007

Description of Noncompliance Findings/Required Actions in OSEP FSM Verification Letter, July 17, 2007	
<p>D. (pages 7-12 & 16)</p> <p>(1) a description of the monitoring procedures that were used to monitor compliance with Part B of the Act, including 34 CFR 300.320(a)(6)(i), as well as other requirements related to assessments included in the Related Requirements documents attached to the SPP/APR package;</p> <p>(2) a report demonstrating that FSM is correcting noncompliance as soon as possible, but not later than one year from the date that FSM identifies noncompliance;</p> <p>(3) the dates and topic of training provided to special education and related services staff in Chuuk;</p> <p>(4) data and information about its progress in reviewing the interagency agreements between the Education Division and the Health Division to ensure compliance with the requirements at 34 CFR 300.154(a)-(c), including information regarding whether the interagency agreements include procedures for timely referrals of children with suspected disabilities for evaluation to comply with 34 CFR 300.301(c)(1);</p> <p>(5) data and information about its progress in implementing the SITS system and training staff about the revised data system; and</p> <p>(6) documentation that FSM is accurately identifying and reporting data on children with disabilities in Chuuk.</p>	
<p>Required Reporting & Timeline</p> <p>FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008. In addition, for #4, if FSM-HESA revised the interagency agreements or determined that the interagency agreements must be revised, FSM-HESA must provide revised interagency agreements to OSEP <u>no later than one year from the date of this letter.</u></p>	
FSM Report Submissions	OSEP Response
<p>February 2008: FSM provided progress data within FSM's FFY 2006 APR submitted to OSEP February 1, 2008.</p> <p>July 2008: FSM submitted its Final Report to OSEP.</p>	<p>June 2008:</p> <p>(1) FSM provided a description of its monitoring procedures, and progress in implementing the requirements at 34 CFR §300.320(a)(6)(i). FSM must clarify in the final report due July 17, 2008 that FSM addresses in its monitoring procedures other requirements related to assessments included in the Related Requirements document attached to the SPP/APR package, and the requirements at 34 CFR §300.320(a)(6)(i).</p> <p>(2) FSM provided information demonstrating that it has monitored each FSM State in 2006-2007 and has incorporated into the process of determination levels a review of each of FSM's State's timely correction of noncompliance. FSM must provide a final report with its July 17, 2008 submission.</p> <p>(3) FSM provided information regarding training for special education staff. In the final report due July 17, 2008, FSM must include information about training provided for staff who provide related services to children with disabilities.</p> <p>(4) FSM provided information about its progress in reviewing the interagency agreements. FSM must provide OSEP with information regarding the results of its review, and any final interagency agreements, as outlined in OSEP's July 17, 2007 verification letter, in the final report due by 7/17/08.</p> <p>(5) FSM reported the required information, and reported that SITS will be fully operational by June 2008. FSM must provide OSEP with information on the status of SITS in the final report due by July 17, 2008.</p> <p>(6) In the FFY 2006 APR, FSM reported data from Chuuk that FSM was not able to collect or report in the FFY 2005 APR. OSEP appreciates FSM's progress in this area.</p> <p>August 2008: In consultation with OSEP, FSM submits progress data in its FFY 2007 APR due to OSEP by February 2, 2009.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

PROGRESS DATA AS OF JANUARY 2009

1. **Chuuk State Training:** Updates as of January 2009: During the on-site verification visit in January 2009, FSM reviewed evidence of training conducted from August 2008 – December 2008 in Chuuk State related to special education:
 - a. Training was held for 35 early childhood teachers, related service assistants and special education staff: “Strategies for Including Preschoolers with Disabilities in Community Settings.”
 - b. FSM early childhood outcomes measurement system training with 144 service providers and family members.
 - c. Follow-up procedural manual and evaluation tools training with 32 special education personnel in attendance.
2. **FSM’s Student Information Tracking System (SITS):** Updates as of January 2009: Refer to Indicator 20 of this APR for updates.
3. **Interagency Agreements (34 CFR §300.154(a)-(c), including CFR 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) specific to Chuuk State:** Updates as of April 7, 2009: As noted in Indicator 15 of this APR under “other” findings of noncompliance and verified correction, the interagency agreement finding specific to Chuuk State was identified and corrected. Based on the FFY 2007 FSM monitoring report, Chuuk State had updated its interagency agreement to be in effect July 3, 2007. Now, the specifics for council by-laws and operational matters are being addressed. The National Interagency Agreement is in progress. On March 20, 2009, the draft FSM National Disability Policy was presented to the 15th FSM Congress for endorsement. This policy outlines eight strategic priorities that support early intervention, education, employment, and community access for individuals with disabilities. The congressional Committee on Health, Education, and Social Affairs committed to submitting the draft FSM National Disability Policy for readings in their next regular session in May 2009. As a result, it is anticipated that the National Interagency Agreement will be developed by August 2009 with the FSM National Disability Policy as the basis and strength for interagency coordination and collaboration.
4. **FSM Fiscal Management Training:** Updates as of April 7, 2009: This activity did not happen due to the availability of FSM Finance staff and Delloitte and Tusch Ross staff. FSM NDOE approached both offices to assist in conducting the training/workshop in December 2008. They agreed and an agenda was drafted and reviewed by FSM Finance representative. As much as Finance agreed to and considered this joint effort important, the scheduled dates for December 2008 and January 2009 did not work. FSM NDOE will make the effort again to plan with FSM Finance and Budget to conduct the training before August 2009.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 1 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: **FM - MICRONESIA**

SECTION A. ENROLLMENT DATA FOR THE MATH ASSESSMENT¹

DATE OF ENROLLMENT COUNT: **12/1/2007**

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH IEPs (1)	ALL STUDENTS (2)
3	0	0
4	0	0
5	0	0
6	108	1540
7	0	0
8	93	1569
HIGH SCHOOL (SPECIFY GRADE:)	10 88	1444

Students with IEPs <= All
Students

¹At a date as close as possible to the testing date.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 2 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

SECTION B. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS	
	TOTAL (3)	SUBSET (OF 3) WHO TOOK THE ASSESSMENT WITH ACCOMODATIONS (3A)
3	0	0
4	0	0
5	0	0
6	83	39
7	0	0
8	47	16
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	17	10

Column 3A should be
≤ column 3

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 3 OF 18
OMB NO. 1820-0659
FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

SECTION B. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT				Sum of col 4A, 4B, & 4C should be equal to Col 4
	TOTAL (4)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4A)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON MODIFIED ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4B)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON ALTERNATE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4C)	
3	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0
6	2	0	0	2	2
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	3	0	0	3	3
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	6	0	0	6	6

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

PAGE 4 OF 18

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

SECTION B. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS COUNTED AS NONPARTICIPANTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH NCLB					Sum of columns 3 through 9 should equal col 1, Section A
	STUDENTS WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ¹ (5)	STUDENTS WHO TOOK AN OUT OF LEVEL TEST (6)	STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE ANY ASSESSMENT			
			PARENTAL EXEMPTION (7)	ABSENT (8)	EXEMPT FOR OTHER REASONS ² (9)	
3	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	6	17	108
7	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	10	33	93
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	0	0	0	8	57	88

¹Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problem in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of assessment, students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly) or changes in testing materials that resulted in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students who took the assessment without these changes.

²In a separate listing, report the number of students who did not take an assessment for other reasons by grade and specific reason.

Please provide the reason(s) for exemption.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 5 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

2007-2008

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT

REGULAR ASSESSMENT BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10A)													
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Advance	Proficiency	Basic	Below Basic						10A ROW TOTAL ¹	Computed row Total	Computed row total should equal col 3
		Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level			
3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	NST	0	1	0	82	0	0	0	0	0	83	83	83
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	NST	0	3	0	44	0	0	0	0	0	47	47	47
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	NST	0	1	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	17	17	17

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: Proficiency

¹The total number of students reported by achievement in 10A is to equal the number reported in column 3.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 6 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

2007-2008

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10B)												Computed row Total	Column 4A should be equal to computed total
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	10B ROW TOTAL ¹		
3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 10		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:

¹The total number of students reported by achievement level in 10B is equal the number reported in column 4A

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
 AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
 PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 7 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON MODIFIED ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10C)															
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME											10C ROW TOTAL ¹	Number of students included Within the NCLB 2% Cap ^{2,3}	Computed row Total	Column 4B should be equal to computed total
		Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level				
3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 10		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:

¹The total number of students reported by achievement level in 10C is to equal the number reported in column 4B.

²Include all students whose assessment counted as proficient because they fell within the NCLB 2% cap.

³Use 2% adjusted cap, in accordance with NCLB provisions, if applicable. See page 8 of attached instructions.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 8 OF 18
OMB NO. 1820-0659
FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009
STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

2007-2008

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON ALTERNATE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10D)														
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Advance	Proficiency	Basic	Below Basic						10D ROW TOTAL ²	Number of Students Included Within the NCLB 1% Cap ¹	Computed row Total	Column 4C should be equal to computed total
		Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level				
3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	FSM NST	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	FSM NST	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	3
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	FSM NST	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	6	6

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: Proficiency

¹Include all students whose assessment counted as proficient because they fell within NCLB 1% cap.

²The total number of students reported by achievement level in 10D is to equal the number reported in column 4C.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 9 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

SECTION C. SUMMARY OF THE PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10A (FROM PAGE 5) ¹	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10B (FROM PAGE 6) ¹	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10C (FROM PAGE 7) ¹	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10D (FROM PAGE 8) ¹	NO VALID SCORE ^{1,2} (11)	TOTAL ^{1,3} (12)	Number reported in col 1, Section A
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	83	0	0	2	23	108	108
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	47	0	0	3	43	93	93
HIGH SCHOOL :	10	17	0	6	65	88	88

¹STATES SHOULD NOT REPORT DATA ON THIS PAGE. THESE DATA WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE REPORTED DATA AFTER THE COUNTS ARE SUBMITTED. PLEASE REVIEW FOR ERRORS.

²Column 11 is calculated by summing the numbers reported in column 5 plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8 plus column 9.

³Column 12 should equal the number of students with IEPs reported in column 1 of Section A. If the number of students is not the same, provide an explanation. Column 12 should always equal the sum of the number of students reported in column 3 plus column 4 plus column 5 plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8 plus column 9.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 10 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

SECTION D. ENROLLMENT DATA FOR THE READING ASSESSMENT¹

DATE OF ENROLLMENT COUNT: 12/1/2007

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH IEPs (1)	ALL STUDENTS (2)
3	0	0
4	0	0
5	0	0
6	108	1540
7	0	0
8	93	1569
HIGH SCHOOL (SPECIFY GRADE:)	10 88	1444

Students with IEPs <= All Students

¹At a date as close as possible to the testing date.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 11 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

FM - MICRONESIA

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS		
	TOTAL (3)	SUBSET (OF 3) WHO TOOK THE ASSESSMENT WITH ACCOMODATIONS (3A)	LEP STUDENTS IN US < 12 MONTHS WHOSE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY (ELP) TEST REPLACED REGULAR READING ASSESSMENT (3B)
3	0	0	0
4	0	0	0
5	0	0	0
6	97	39	0
7	0	0	0
8	68	18	0
HIGH SCHOOL :	10		
	20	12	0

Column 3A + 3B
should be <= Column 3

¹Report those LEP students who, at the time of the reading assessment, were in the United States for less than 10 months and took the English Language Proficiency (ELP) test in place of the regular reading assessment.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 12 OF 18
OMB NO. 1820-0659
FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT				Sum of col 4A, 4B, & 4C should be equal to Col 4
	TOTAL (4)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4A)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON MODIFIED ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4B)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON ALTERNATE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (4C)	
3	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0
6	1	0	0	1	1
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	2	0	0	2	2
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	3	0	0	3	3

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

PAGE 13 OF 18

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS COUNTED AS NONPARTICIPANTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH NCLB					Sum of columns 3 through 9 should equal col 1, Section D
	STUDENTS WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ¹ (5)	STUDENTS WHO TOOK AN OUT OF LEVEL TEST (6)	STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE ANY ASSESSMENT			
			PARENTAL EXEMPTION (7)	ABSENT (8)	DID NOT TAKE FOR OTHER REASONS ² (9)	
3	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	10	0	108
7	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	10	13	93
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	0	0	0	8	57	88

¹Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problem in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of assessment, students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly) or changes in testing materials that resulted in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students who took the assessment without these changes.

²In a separate listing, report the number of students who did not take an assessment for other reasons by grade and specific reason.

Please provide the reason(s) for exemption.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 14 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

2007-2008

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT

REGULAR ASSESSMENT BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10A)												Computed row Total	Computed row total should equal col 3 minus col 3B
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Advance Achievement Level	Proficiency Achievement Level	Basic Achievement Level	Below Basic Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	10A ROW TOTAL ¹		
3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	NST	0	1	0	96	0	0	0	0	0	97	97	97
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	NST	0	3	0	65	0	0	0	0	0	68	68	68
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	NST	0	4	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	20	20	20

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: Proficiency

¹The total number of students reported by achievement in 10A is to equal the number reported in column 3.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 15 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

2007-2008

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10B)												Computed row Total	Column 4A should be equal to computed total
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	10B ROW TOTAL ¹		
3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 10		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:

¹The total number of students reported by achievement level in 10B is equal the number reported in column 4A.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
 AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
 OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
 PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

PAGE 16 OF 18

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
 ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON MODIFIED ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10C)														
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	10C ROW TOTAL ¹	Number of students included Within the NCLB 2% Cap ^{2,3}	Computed row Total	Column 4B should be equal to computed total
3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 10		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:

¹The total number of students reported by achievement level in 10C is to equal the number reported in column 4B.

²Include all students whose assessment counted as proficient because they fell within the NCLB 2% cap.

³Use 2% adjusted cap, in accordance with NCLB provisions, if applicable. See page 8 of attached instructions.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 17 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON ALTERNATE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10D)															
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Advance	Proficiency	Basic	Below Basic							10D ROW TOTAL ²	Number of Students Included Within the NCLB 1% Cap ¹	Computed row Total	Column 4C should be equal to computed total
		Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level				
3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	FSM NST	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	FSM NST	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	FSM NST	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	3

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: Proficiency

¹Include all students whose assessment counted as proficient because they fell within NCLB 1% cap.

²The total number of students reported by achievement level in 10D is to equal the number reported in column 4C.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 18 OF 18

OMB NO. 1820-0659

FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

2007-2008

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

SECTION F. SUMMARY OF THE PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10A (FROM PAGE 14) ¹	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10B (FROM PAGE 15) ¹	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10C (FROM PAGE 16) ¹	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10D (FROM PAGE 17) ¹	NO VALID SCORE ^{1,2} (11)	TOTAL ^{1,3} (12)	Number reported in col 1, Section D
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	97	0	0	1	10	108	108
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	68	0	0	2	23	93	93
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	20	0	0	3	65	88	88

¹STATES SHOULD NOT REPORT DATA ON THIS PAGE. THESE DATA WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE REPORTED DATA AFTER THE COUNTS ARE SUBMITTED. PLEASE REVIEW FOR ERRORS.

²Column 11 is calculated by summing the numbers reported in column 5 plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8 plus column 9.

³Column 12 should equal the number of students with IEPs reported in column 1 of Section A. If the number of students is not the same, provide an explanation. Column 12 should always equal the sum of the number of students reported in column 3 plus column 4 plus column 5 plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8 plus column 9.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 7
REPORT OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION UNDER PART B, OF THE
INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT
2006-07

PAGE 1 OF 1
OMB NO.: 1820-0677
FORM EXPIRES: XX/XX/XXXX

STATE: **FM - MICRONESIA**

SECTION A: WRITTEN, SIGNED COMPLAINTS	
(1) Written, signed complaints total	0
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	0
(a) Reports with findings	0
(b) Reports within timelines	0
(c) Reports with extended timelines	0
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	0
(1.3) Complaints pending	0
(a) Complaint pending a due process hearing	0

Sections 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 should equal section 1.	0
---	---

SECTION B: MEDIATION REQUESTS	
(2) Mediation requests total	0
(2.1) Mediations	0
(a) Mediations related to due process	0
(i) Mediation agreements	0
(b) Mediations not related to due process	0
(i) Mediation agreements	0
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	0

0	Sections 2.1 and 2.2 should equal section 2.
0	Sections 2.1a and 2.1b equal section 2.1.

SECTION C: HEARING REQUESTS	
(3) Hearing requests total	0
(3.1) Resolution sessions	0
(a) Settlement agreements	0
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	0
(a) Decisions within timeline	0
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	0
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	0

Sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 should equal section 3.	0
---	---

SECTION D: EXPEDITED HEARING REQUESTS (RELATED TO DISCIPLINARY DECISION)	
(4) Expedited hearing requests total	0
(4.1) Resolution sessions	0
(a) Settlement agreements	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated)	0
(a) Change of placement ordered	0

Sections 4.1 and 4.2 should equal section 4.	0
--	---

