

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The Federated States of Micronesia, National Department of Education (FSM NDOE) is a unitary education system with the delivery of special education and related services implemented within the four FSM island states: Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap. Given FSM's unique geographic context, NDOE has established a general supervision structure similar to a State Education Agency (SEA) and Local Education Agency (LEA) structure for administering, supervising, and monitoring the implementation of the IDEA requirements. 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 collected the data for and facilitated the development of the 2008-2009 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. During the months of January 2009 – September 2009, each LEA convened their special education advisory panel for the development of their IDEA Part B Local Performance Plan (LPP) for school year 2009-2010. The LPP follows the same indicator measures as the FSM SPP, but with a focus on the LEA implementation of priorities established in the FSM SPP. The progress data reviewed in the LPP included 2005-2006, 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009 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 1, 2009, was shared as a review of the alignment of the LEA quarterly and annual (LPP) reporting with the overall FSM SPP and APR requirements. The LEA advisory panel 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: January 21, 2009, April 9, 2009, June 30, 2009
- Chuuk State: May 29, 2009, June 11 & 12, 2009, September 12, 2009, September 25, 2009
- Pohnpei State: Advisory panel and key special education staff met on the 1st Thursday of each month and held a special meeting on June 19, 2009
- Yap State: June 10, 15-19, 26, 2009, September 16, 2009

During these LEA special education advisory panel meetings, stakeholders reviewed the LEA-specific performance for 2005-2006, 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009 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, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20. For the 2008-2009 OSEP reporting purpose, Indicators 6, 13, and 14 do not require reporting, Indicator 7 is reported in the updated SPP, and Indicators 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to the FSM. To address the noncompliance issues raised in previous reporting, Indicator 13 includes data and information related to the correction of previously identified noncompliance. Based on the progress data reported for 2008-2009, the LEAs identified LEA-specific priorities for school year 2009-2010.

During FFY 2008 (2008-2009), NDOE reviewed LEA progress data and information for each Indicator measure through updates provided in the LEA quarterly reports. As a result of each quarterly review, NDOE provided feedback regarding correction of any identified noncompliance, progress data, and implementation of improvement activities. In addition, in January 2009, the FSM National SPP/APR Committee convened to review LEA FFY 2008 progress data.

OSEP Determination Letter, June 2009

As noted in the letter, FSM's FFY 2007 determination of "needs assistance" was the second consecutive determination of "needs assistance" determination level. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of IDEA and 34

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

CFR §300.604, the Secretary advised FSM of available sources of technical assistance related to Indicator 11 (timely initial evaluations), Indicator 13 (secondary transition), Indicator 15 (timely correction of noncompliance, and Indicator 20 (timely and accurate data requirements) through the SPP/APR Planning Calendar website. FSM provides the following information on the technical assistance sources accessed that supported the development of APR Indicators 11, 13, 15, and 20:

- The Technical Assistance Sources from which FSM Received Assistance:
 - NDOE and State LEA Special Education Administrators, Coordinators, and staff participated in the Secondary Transition Planning and APR Clinic sponsored by the Western Regional Resource Center (WRRRC) on Guam, January 12-16, 2009. These regional events were designed to provide additional insights for addressing all APR indicator measurement requirements for reporting, with emphasis on Indicator 13.
 - NDOE accessed the SPP/APR Planning Calendar website for relevant resources related to Indicators 11, 13, 15, and 20.
 - NDOE accessed technical support from the University of Guam CEDDERS, WRRRC, SDSU Interwork Institute, NPSO, and FSM's OSEP State Contact.
 - During OSEP's on-site verification/monitoring visit to FSM the week of November 16, 2009, NDOE received technical support from the OSEP visiting team.

- The Actions FSM took as a Result of that Technical Assistance:
 - NDOE on-site verification/monitoring visit to the State LEAs provided an opportunity to share information and resources related to Indicators 11 and 13 for the State LEAs to incorporate into their LPP review and development.
 - NDOE participated in the OSEP data meeting held in June 2009 and OSEP leadership meeting held in August 2009 to further the review of resources for improving performance specific to Indicators 11, 13, 15, and 20.
 - NDOE conducted additional on-site focused technical assistance visits to Chuuk State to support the system review of Indicators 11 and 13, as well as the outstanding Chuuk-specific noncompliance identified by OSEP in 2006.

With consideration of the technical support accessed, as advised by the Secretary, NDOE convened the FSM National SPP/APR Committee to review the compiled aggregated LEA data and information for inclusion into the overall FSM 2008-2009 APR, including recommendations for possible revisions to targets and improvement activities. The following sessions were held:

- **September 7-11, 2009:** The FSM National SPP/APR meeting was held in Pohnpei to review 2008-2009 performance from each LEA through the development of their 2009-2010 LPP. The four LEA LPP data aggregated at the SEA/National-level served as the basis for the FSM 2008-2009 APR. With technical support from Guam CEDDERS and SDSU Interwork, 14 representatives from each FSM state and NDOE Special Education Program reviewed each LEA's LPP for 2009-2010 in preparation for FSM's FFY 2008 SPP/APR submission to OSEP in February 2010. As a result, each LEA was required to verify specific data and information and update the LPP for re-submission to NDOE by September 30, 2009. In addition, on Friday, September 11, 2009, Ms. De Leon met with NDOE Special Education administrators to review the preparation activities for OSEP's verification visit to FSM scheduled the week of November 16, 2009.

- **November 14, 2009:** The FSM National SPP/APR Committee met in Pohnpei to review verified data included in the revised LPPs submitted September 30, 2009. With technical support from Guam CEDDERS, 10 LEA advisory panel chairpersons, LEA special education coordinators, and NDOE special education administrators reviewed the revisions, which resulted in an updated FFY 2007 and 2008 At-A-Glance sheet and Needed Updates list for each LEA. The revised LPPs were shared during OSEP's verification visit the week of November 16, 2009 with the understanding that the "needed updates" will be verified in January 2010 for inclusion into FSM's FFY 2008 APR due to OSEP by February 1, 2010.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

- **January 12-16, 2010:** The FSM National SPP/APR Committee met in Kosrae to review each LEA's verified data and information from the Needed Updates list generated on November 14, 2009. With technical support from Guam CEDDERS, 20 representatives from NDOE and each LEA verified the LEA updates for inclusion into each FSM SPP and APR Indicator performance and improvement activities.
- **February 1, 2010:** Final Part B APR submitted to OSEP.

PUBLIC DISSEMINATION PLAN

As required, 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 2008-2009 APR, NDOE will implement the following public dissemination:

1. By February 8, 2010, upon submission of the FSM IDEA Part B APR to the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs on February 1, 2010, 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 7, 2010, NDOE, Special Education Program will post the FSM IDEA Part B APR on the FSM NDOE websites: <http://www.fsmed.fm> and <http://www.fsmsped.org/dashboard>. This will incorporate any clarification provided to the APR during OSEP's April 2010 clarification week. The 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 14, 2010, a letter from the 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 14, 2010, 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.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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.

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

Measurement: States must report using the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008 (2008-2009)	As per OSEP's instruction, beginning FFY 2008 (2008-2009), required reporting is the state's examination of data for the year before the reporting year (e.g. for the FFY 2008 APR, use data from 2007-2008). Therefore, for Indicator 1, the target and actual data for FFY 2008 will be the FFY 2007 data.
2007 (2007-2008)	76% of youth with IEP's will graduate with a high school diploma.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009): As per OSEP's instruction, Actual Target Data will be the actual data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

As one of the Freely Associated States (FAS), FSM does not report graduation data to the Department under Title 1 of ESEA. FSM therefore continues to use the senior enrollment calculation to determine FSM's annual graduation rate for youth with IEPs graduating with a regular high school diploma. The total number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular high school diploma is consistent with the 618 reported exit data.

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

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

The following Table shows the breakdown of FSM's actual data by the four FSM State LEAs:

FSM Breakdown of State LEAs Percent of Youth with IEPs who Graduated with a Diploma

State	# & % Youth with IEPs with a High School 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 Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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

- 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).
- Chuuk State reported that 50% or 4 out of the 8 seniors with IEPs 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 2008 (2008-2009):

As per OSEP's instructions, **for this APR, FSM will report FFY 2007 (2007-2008) data and compare it to FSM's FFY 2007 (2007-2008) target. Additional information is provided for FFY 2008 to show progress data for this Indicator.**

FSM's overall National data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008) of 81% (35/43) exceeded the SPP target of 76%.

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 (high school credits apply to grades 10-12); 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, FSM State LEAs continue to report a low number of seniors with IEPs enrolled.

Additional Data and Information for FFY 2008 (2008-2009)

FSM graduation rate target set for FFY 2008 is 77%. FSM exceeded the FFY 2008 target with the actual overall National data reported at 90% (18/20), which demonstrates progress from the FFY 2007 performance of 81% (35/43). FFY 2008 actual data used the same senior enrollment calculation method for determining graduation rates as FFY 2007.

In 2008-2009, FSM continued participation in various OSEP-funded project activities to increase personnel knowledge and skills for providing support to youth with IEPs requiring appropriate secondary transition services, including access to the general curriculum, to ensure successful high school graduation with a regular high school diploma. In collaboration with University of Guam CEDDERS, University of Hawaii, and University of Oregon's Western Regional Resource Center (WRRRC), FSM NDOE has been able to provide the technical support to each LEA to support general education and special education personnel training and development activities related to secondary education.

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.

'08-'09 Progress: FSM participates in OSEP-funded regional projects facilitated by the University of Guam CEDDERS. In August 2008, FSM participated in the Pacific CIMAP regional institute held on Guam designed to provide hands-on training on providing timely educational materials in accessible formats (Braille, large print, audio, and digital) for students with print

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

disabilities, as required by the IDEA NIMAS. The institute included the use of technology for accessing and creating educational materials in accessible formats. As part of Pacific CIMAP, each FSM LEA was issued a set of equipment, tools, and software to produce the accessible formats in their island communities. Follow-up on-site technical support was provided for each LEA to develop standard operating procedures for maximizing the use of technology and equipment for producing educational materials in accessible formats for students with print disabilities to access the general curriculum.

In January 2009, FSM participated in a regional Secondary Transition Workshop conducted by Dr. Ed O'leary and the Western Regional Resource Center (WRRRC) on Guam. The 2-day workshop provided guidance and support for meeting the secondary transition requirements.

In February and July 2009, FSM participated in the OSEP-funded PACIFIC Project regional events facilitated by Guam CEDDERS. The February 2009 event focused on the development of a local "cadre" for providing technical support to IEP teams on providing supports to students with significant cognitive disabilities participating in an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAS), which includes supporting instruction for accessing the general curriculum. The July 2009 regional event furthered the cadre development by offering best practices strategies, including the use of Universal Design for Learning (UDL), for students with significant cognitive disabilities to access the general curriculum and improve results in their performance in the AA-AAS.

In June 2009, FSM National hired a secondary transition specialist to facilitate National training activities related to secondary transition, which would include priorities established for SPP Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14.

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.

'08-'09 Progress:

In March 2009, FSM conducted on-site LEA training on SITS, inclusive of the 618 reporting and secondary transition requirements.

In November 2009, a follow-up FSM SITS training was conducted in Pohnpei for all LEAs on the SITS data dictionary, user's manual, and 618 data tables.

In June and August 2009, FSM consulted with the National Center on Post-School Outcomes (NPSO) on the SITS data elements for the secondary transition requirements and the new definition for post-school outcomes.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-2010:

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

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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 IEP's dropping out of high school.

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

Measurement: States must report using the dropout data used in the ESEA graduation rate calculation and follow the timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008 (2008-2009)	As per OSEP's instruction, beginning FFY 2008 (2008-2009), required reporting is the state/entity examination of data for the year before the reporting year (e.g. for the FFY 2008 APR, use data from 2007-2008). Therefore, for Indicator 2, the target and actual data for FFY 2008 will be the FFY 2007 data.
2007 (2007-2008)	2.5% of Youth with IEPs drop out of high school.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009): As per OSEP's instruction, Actual Target Data will be the actual data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

As one of the Freely Associated States (FAS), FSM does not report drop-out data to the Department under Title 1 of ESEA. FSM therefore continues to use the high school enrollment calculation to determine FSM's annual drop-out rate for youth with IEPs in high school. The total number of youth with IEPs that drop-out is consistent with the 618 reported exit data.

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	# & % Youth with IEPs who Dropped Out 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 LEAs for FFY 2005 (2005-2006), FFY 2006 (2006-2007), and FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

The following tables show comparison data for FFY 2005 through 2007 for each LEA:

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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

KOSRAE:

KOSRAE State LEA	# & % Drop-Outs in Kosrae								
	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 Pohnpei								
	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 Yap								
	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%

In FFY 2007, Pohnpei State met the FSM SPP target at 1.1% (2/179) youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. Chuuk, Kosrae, and Yap State were the LEAs that did not meet the FSM SPP target of 2.5% drop-out rate. For Yap State there were 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 LEA reporting significant “**progress**” of students that dropped out was from Kosrae State, with a decrease of 10% from 18% (7/38) reported in FFY 2006 to 8.8% or 5/57 for the FFY 2007 reporting period. With the new administration in Kosrae State, there was a change of policy that ensures students with disabilities are not suspended because of poor academic performance, which appeared to have contributed to the previous year’s drop-out rate.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

As per OSEP’s instructions, for this APR, FSM will report FFY 2007 (2007-2008) data and compare it to FSM’s FFY 2007 (2007-2008) target. Additional information is provided for FFY 2008 to show progress data for this Indicator.

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**” with a decrease by 1% from 4% (14/346) in the FFY 2006 reporting period to 3% (13/383) for the FFY 2007 reporting period. FSM’s drop-out definition is consistent with the definition used for reporting 618 exit data.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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 problems. The purpose of RTI is to identify students at risk for poor learning outcomes, monitor 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. In FFY 2008, the Pacific RTI Initiative was established and continued, through teleconference calls, planning for regional training activities to begin in summer 2009.

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 to ensure that the student would elect to complete his/her high school years. The result of this action plan is evident with the decrease of students with IEPs dropping out of high school.

Additional Data and Information for FFY 2008 (2008-2009)

FSM target for FFY 2008 is 2%. FSM's actual data for FFY 2008 was 6% (21/336), which represents slippage from 3% (13/383) in FFY 2007. FSM did not meet its target for FFY 2008. The breakdown by LEA report the following:

FFY 2008 (2008-2009) LEA	(a) # of Youth with IEPs who Dropped Out	(b) # of Youth with IEPs Enrolled in High School	(c) % of Youth with IEPs who Dropped Out ((a) divided by (b) x 100)
Chuuk	5	53	9%
Kosrae	6	48	13%
Pohnpei	8	183	4%
Yap	2	52	4%
FSM Total	21	336	6%

With the percentage doubling from FFY 2007 to FFY 2008, FSM conducted a review of the reasons for the increase in percentage. As discussed during the FSM National SPP/APR Committee meeting held in September 2009, the number of drop-outs increased by 1 in Chuuk and Kosrae, while Yap remained the same with 2 drop-outs. Pohnpei however increased from 2 dropping out in FFY 2007 to 8 dropping out in FFY 2008, which represented an increase of 4 times the number. Pohnpei reported that the drop-outs were from one high school. At the beginning of school year 2009-2010, Pohnpei took additional steps to address this increase in drop-outs, especially in the one high school. A specific transition supervisor was assigned to the one high school and 3 vocational education teachers were hired to support the instructional needs of students with IEPs at all high schools.

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

Improvement Activity 1: During school year 2005-2006, FSM 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.

'08-'09 Progress: Completed. Drop-out definition consistent among LEAs. LEAs working on implementation and tracking of drop-out data.

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

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

levels: School, LEA, and National, to include federal reporting for drop-out data (exit data for special education).

'08-'09 Progress:

The LEAs use PEDMS to collect data for the 20 indicators for JEMCO. The PEDMS is an excel database. The data collected through PEDMS related to special education include enrollment, attendance, graduation, assessment, drop-out, and suspension. The LEAs submit their data via "hard" copy to National Education Office for input into EMIS, an access application database. NDOE is in the process of interfacing PEDMS with EMIS, but has not done so as a system. The application of excel to access can be done, but has not been done.

Improvement Activity 3:

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

'08-'09 Progress:

Deleted. Following the new measurement requirement for Indicator 2, comparison data will not be collected and reported.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-2010:

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

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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 IEPs on statewide assessments:

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

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

Measurement:

- A. AYP percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size)] times 100.
- B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in the assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.
- C. Proficiency rate percent = ([(# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math)].

The revised Indicator and measurement language has been incorporated into the updated revised complete FSM SPP and posted on the FSM NDOE websites: <http://www.fsmed.fm> and <http://www.fsmsped.org/dashboard>.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008 (2008-2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Not Applicable to FSM. B. 80% participation rate of children with IEPs. C. 3% increase in proficiency rate from 2005-2006 for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

Measurement A: Does not apply to the FSM.

Measurement B: Participation Rate

The Spring 2009 FSM National Standardized Test (NST) was administered to all students with and without disabilities in grades 6, 8 and 10. An alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAS) was also administered to students with significant cognitive disabilities in those tested grades.

618 Table 6: Statewide Math Assessment for SY 2008-2009 – Participation

For school year 2008-2009, NDOE did not administer the Math NST to students with and without disabilities. The revised Math instrument did not meet the timeline for administration in spring 2009. It is anticipated that the revised Math instrument will be administered for school year 2009-2010 in spring 2010.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

618 Table 6: Statewide Reading Assessment for SY 2008-2009 – Participation

2007-2008 National Standardized Test (NST)		3B. PARTICIPATION: READING Assessment				
		Grade 6	Grade 8	Grade 10	TOTAL	
					#	%
a.	Children with IEPs	199	114	169	482	
b.	Regular assess with NO accommodations	18	29	28	75	15.6
c.	Regular assess with accommodations	42	41	22	105	21.8
d.	AA against grade-level academic achievement standards	FSM does not have an alternate assessment (AA) that tests children against grade-level academic achievement standards.				
e.	AA against modified academic achievement standards	FSM does not have an AA that tests children against modified academic achievement standards.				
f.	AA against alternate academic achievement standards	5	3	11	19	3.9
Overall: [(b+c+d+e+f) divided by a]		33% (65/199)	64% (73/114)	36% (61/169)	199/482	41.3%
Children with IEPs included in "a" but not included in the other subcategories:						
Absent		134	41	108	283	58.7%

Measurement C: Proficiency Rates

618 Table 6: Statewide Math Assessment for SY 2008-2009 – Proficiency

For school year 2008-2009, NDOE did not administer the Math NST to students with and without disabilities. The revised Math instrument did not meet the timeline for administration in spring 2009. It is anticipated that the revised Math instrument will be administered for school year 2009-2010 in spring 2010.

618 Table 6: Statewide Reading Assessment for SY 2008-2009 – Proficiency

2008-2009 National Standardized Test (NST)		3C. PROFICIENCY: READING Assessment				
		Grade 6	Grade 8	Grade 10	TOTAL	
					#	%
a.	Children with IEPs (Full Academic Year)	199	114	169	482	
b.	Proficient or above in regular assess with NO accommodations	0	0	0	0	0
c.	Proficient or above in regular assess with accommodations	0	3	0	3	.6
d.	Proficient or above in AA against grade-level academic achievement standards	FSM does not have an AA that tests children against grade-level academic achievement standards.				
e.	Proficient or above in AA against modified academic achievement standards	FSM does not have an AA that tests children against modified academic achievement standards.				
f.	Proficient or above in AA against alternate academic achievement standards	1	0	2	3	.6
Overall: [(b+c+d+e+f) divided by a]		.5% (1/199)	2.6% (3/114)	1.1% (2/169)	6/482	1.2%

Public Reporting Requirement for Assessment Data. As instructed, FSM is required to provide the URL (electronic link) to the location where FSM publicly reports on assessments for students with disabilities with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled students, pursuant to 34 CFR 300.160(f). FSM reports that NDOE does not publicly report assessment data for nondisabled students. FSM provides participation and performance data of students with disabilities through the APR and 618 data table, which are posted on the FSM NDOE websites: <http://www.fsmed.fm> and <http://www.fsmsted.org/dashboard>.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

As reported in FSM's 618 data for statewide assessment displayed in the actual target for FFY 2008, FSM did not meet its targets for participation and proficiency in reading with a performance of 41.3% (199/482) for participation and 1.2% (6/482) for proficiency. FSM's performance also represents slippage from the reported data for FFY 2007 of 66% (191/289) for participation in reading and 3% (9/289) for proficiency in reading. All students with IEPs in the tested grades were enrolled for a full academic year in FFY 2008.

In analyzing the slippage reported by FSM in the reading, the total number of students with IEPs that participated in the FFY 2008 represented an increase from 191 in FFY 2007 to 199 in FFY 2008. The proficiency numbers showed a slight decrease from 9 in FFY 2007 to 6 in FFY 2008. The total number of students with IEPs in the tested grades, which also represented students with IEPs enrolled in a full academic year, increased from a total number of 289 in FFY 2007 to 482 in FFY 2008. The reason for the increase in students with IEPs in the tested grades was primarily due to Chuuk reporting that all schools participated in FSM's state-wide assessment during FFY 2008, and Pohnpei's 10th grade sampling done in only one high school.

In previous years, Chuuk administered the NST using a school sampling formula. FFY 2008 was the first year that Chuuk attempted to administer the NST system-wide, which required additional support to ensure that all students, including students with disabilities, participate. The results of Chuuk's system-wide participation indicated that the system still required additional resources and support to effectively administer the NST to all schools, especially those remote islands outside the main island of Weno that require transportation via boat or field ship. As reported, only 44% (1369/3137) of Chuuk's students with and without disabilities enrolled in the tested grades of 6, 8, and 10 participated in the NST or AA-AAS. It is anticipated that Chuuk will have additional resources in spring 2010 to account for the system-wide implementation of the NST.

In previous years, Pohnpei used a sampling formula for administering the NST to 10th graders. In FFY 2008, the NST was administered to all students in the 10th grade in 2 of the 3 high schools. The only high school that continued 10th grade sampling is the largest public high school in Pohnpei.

The increased enrollment in the tested grades shows FSM's commitment to improving the participation of all students in the NST or AA-AAS. It is anticipated that for FFY 2010 improved communication and resource allocation for administering the NST or AA-AAS will allow for better coordination between FSM NDOE and each LEA to increase the participation of all students, including students with IEPs, in the tested grades.

FSM continues to support the development and implementation of FSM's AA-AAS through participation in the PACIFIC Project, an OSEP-funded grant administered by the University of Guam CEDDERS. The development and implementation of an AA-AAS for students with significant cognitive disabilities have also raised awareness of the need to provide the academic instruction or access to the general curriculum for all students, including those students with IEPs who require school and home services. In addition, through the Pacific CIMAP, an OSEP-funded project administered through the University of Guam CEDDERS, personnel knowledge and skills have increased for providing educational materials in accessible formats (Braille, large print, audio, and digital) for students with print disabilities. Pacific CIMAP provided each LEA with equipment, tools, and software for accessing and creating the accessible formats, which include assessment instruments for testing.

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).

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

'08-'09 Progress:

In August 2008, FSM participated in the Pacific CIMAP regional institute held on Guam designed to provide hands-on training on providing timely educational materials in accessible formats (Braille, large print, audio, and digital) for students with print disabilities, as required by the IDEA NIMAS. The institute included the use of technology for accessing and creating educational materials in accessible formats. As part of Pacific CIMAP, each LEA was issued a set of equipment, tools, and software to produce the accessible formats in their island communities. Follow-up on-site technical support was provided for each LEA to develop standard operating procedures for maximizing the use of technology and equipment for producing educational materials in accessible formats for students with print disabilities to access the general curriculum.

In August 2008, the FSM Leadership Assessment Team participated in the Pacific Assessment Consortium's Regional Institute, facilitated by Guam CEDDERS. The regional institute provided the FSM team with a greater understanding of the research, best practices and technical qualities for development and implementation of AA-AAS. The FSM team also began drafting the FSM Teacher Guidelines for determining participation and implementing the AA-AAS for students with significant cognitive disabilities. Guam CEDDERS conducted on-site follow-up TA visits in November 2008 and May 2009 to provide support with the completion of the draft Teacher Guidelines.

In February and July 2009, FSM participated in the OSEP-funded PACIFIC Project regional events facilitated by Guam CEDDERS. The February 2009 event focused on the development of a local "cadre" for providing technical support to IEP teams on providing supports to students with significant cognitive disabilities participating in an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAS), which includes supporting instruction for accessing the general curriculum. The July 2009 regional event furthered the cadre development by offering best practices strategies, including the use of Universal Design for Learning (UDL), for students with significant cognitive disabilities to access the general curriculum and improve results in their performance in the AA-AAS.

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.

'08-'09 Progress:

Completed in 2007-2008.

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.

'08-'09 Progress:

Completed in 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

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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.

'08-'09 Progress:

Refer to progress noted for Improvement Activity 1.

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.

'08-'09 Progress:

The Optical Machine Reader (OMR) is used to scan the NST answer sheets which include a code for special education and regular education students (01 for SpEd and 00 for GenEd). The OMR reports could be disaggregated for each group. The OMR report is provided to each LEA. Each LEA then inputs the data into PEDMS and provides National with the data.

SITS is the special education web-based access application database. The data from PEDMS are reviewed by the special education staff and inputted into 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-NDOE and the FSM-NDOE on-site monitoring/verification visits, as scheduled during the school year.

'08-'09 Progress:

Refer to progress noted for Improvement Activity 1. Further, on-site technical support provided by the GSEG PAC6 (PACIFIC) Project has supported FSM to ensure implementation of the IEP determination for participation by students with IEPs in the tested grades.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines /Resources for 2009-2010:

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.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008 (2008-2009)	As per OSEP's instruction, beginning FFY 2008 (2008-2009), required reporting is the state's examination of data for the year before the reporting year (e.g. for the FFY 2008 APR, use data from 2007-2008). Therefore, for Indicator 4, the target and actual data for FFY 2008 will be the FFY 2007 data.
2007 (2007-2008)	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. B. Not applicable to FSM.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009): As per OSEP's instruction, Actual Target Data will be the actual data from 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%.

FSM's definition of "significant discrepancy" is a 2% difference between the LEAs. This is calculated by determining each LEA's rate and then analyzing the rates to determine if any LEA's rate is 2% more than the lowest LEA rate. A review of the data from year to year will provide additional information for revising,

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

if needed, FSM's "significant discrepancy" definition. This review will be conducted because, in previous years, FSM has reported "0" suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for students with disabilities. Thus, trend data were not available to conduct the analyses to determine what level of discrepancy would be "significant."

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: Does not apply to the FSM.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

As per OSEP's instructions, for this APR, FSM will report FFY 2007 (2007-2008) data and compare it to FSM's FFY 2007 (2007-2008) target. Additional information is provided for FFY 2008 to show progress data for this Indicator.

In FFY 2007, FSM met its target of 0% significant discrepancy between FSM LEAs. For the first time, 2 of the 4 LEAs reported long-term suspension/expulsion data for students with IEPs. The reported comparison amongst the 4 LEAs however did not show a significant discrepancy of 2% difference with Pohnpei reporting .3% (2/734) and Yap reporting .8% (1/123).

Additional Data and Information for FFY 2008 (2008-2009)

In FFY 2008, FSM met its target of 0% significant discrepancy between FSM State LEAs with only Yap reporting 1.4% (2/144) students with disabilities suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days. The other 3 FSM State LEAs reported "0" students with disabilities suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days. Compared to the FFY 2007 reporting year, Yap increased the number of reported students with disabilities from 1 to 2. Although a small number, FSM facilitated a discussion with the 4 LEAs regarding ensuring that the procedural safeguards for students with disabilities are protected. The individual cases reviewed met all the requirements.

OSEP's Response Table, June 2009

In the OSEP Response table, OSEP expressed an appreciation of FSM's efforts to improvement performance. Further, OSEP noted that in the revised Part B indicator Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, FSM must again describe the results of FSM's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008).

FSM's Response to OSEP's Response Table, June 2009

Although FSM did not report a significant discrepancy of students with disabilities suspended/expelled greater than 10 days between the 4 LEAs, FSM reviewed the procedural requirements with the LEA Special Education Coordinators to ensure the individual rights of the students suspended/expelled are protected. Further, the LEAs were encouraged to address behavioral issues, such as attendance problems or suspension, prior to suspension or the 10th day of suspension through a review of practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs and the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports.

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 to ensure consistency in "suspension/expulsion" definition in all four LEAs.

'08-'09 Progress: The annual review of suspension and expulsion data ensure consistency in definition used by all four LEAs. All states use PEDMS to collect data for the 20 indicators for JEMCO. The PEDMS is an excel database. The data collected through PEDMS related to special education include enrollment, attendance, graduation, assessment, drop-out, and suspension. The states submit their data via "hard" copy to National Department. Suspension and expulsion data are inputted into SITS and verified with each LEA.

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.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

'08-'09 Progress: Refer to progress noted for Improvement Activity 1.

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-NDOE and the FSM-NDOE on-site monitoring/verification visits, as scheduled during the school year.

'08-'09 Progress: FSM continues to review suspension/expulsion data through the FSM LEA quarterly reports and on-site monitoring visits.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines /Resources for 2009-2010:

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

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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 served:

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

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs serves inside the 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 facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

The revised Indicator and measurement language has been incorporated into the updated revised complete FSM SPP and posted on the FSM NDOE websites: <http://www.fsmed.fm> and <http://www.fsmsped.org/dashboard>.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008 (2008-2009)	<p>A. 97.75% of children ages 6-21 with IEPs were served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</p> <p>B. .25% of children ages 6-21 with IEPs were served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</p> <p>C. 1.75% of children ages 6-21 with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospitals placements</p>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

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%
December 1, 2008	1407	1175	84%	89	6%	111	8%

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

OSEP 618 LRE Placement Data by FSM LEAs for FFYs 2002-2008:

CHUUK: 2002-2008: 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%
December 1, 2008	486	436	90%	0	0	50	10%

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

KOSRAE: 2002-2008: 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%
December 1, 2008	144	120	83%	0	0	24	17%

POHNPEI: 2002-2008: 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%
December 1, 2008	638	503	79%	89	14%	21	3%

YAP: 2002-2008: 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%

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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, 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%
December 1, 2008	139	116	83%	0	0%	16	12%

Data Source: LRE data used for this indicator is taken from the 618 Child Count.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

Measurement A: FSM did not meet its target of 97.75%, but was able to maintain performance at 84% in FFY 2008 and FFY 2007.

Measurement B: FSM did not meet its target of .25%, but was able to report progress with 6% (89/1407) in FFY 2008 from 7% (105/1513) in FFY 2007.

Measurement C: FSM did not meet its target of 1.75%, with the FFY 2008 performance of 8% (111/1407) representing slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 7% (102/1513).

Although FSM did not meet its target for all 3 LRE measurements, FSM still demonstrates a significantly higher percentage of students with IEPs served inside the regular classroom for 80% or more of the day with 84% in FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 compared to the U.S. National mean of 59.19%, as reported in the FFY 2007 Part B SPP/APR Indicator Analyses completed by NIUSI-LeadScape. Further, of the reported LRE data from the 60 states and unique states, the minimum percentage reported for Measurement A (inside the regular classroom for 80% or more of the day) was 17.37%, a significantly lower percentage than FSM's 84% performance for FFY 2007 and FFY 2008.

FSM continued participation in various OSEP-funded project activities to increase personnel knowledge and skills for providing support to students with IEPs access the general curriculum. Specifically, the University of Guam CEDDERS' Pacific CIMAP and PACIFIC Project have provided opportunities for FSM to engage in regional institutes and on-site technical support to administrators, specialists, teachers, families, and children with IEPs.

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

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.

'08-'09 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

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

for providing special education and related services in general education program environments.

'08-'09 Progress:

FSM State specific training conducted in each LEA following the 2006 revisions to the Special Education Procedural Manual, which includes the LRE provisions.

FSM participates in OSEP-funded regional projects facilitated by the University of Guam CEDDERS. In August 2008, FSM participated in the Pacific CIMAP regional institute held on Guam designed to provide hands-on training on providing timely educational materials in accessible formats (Braille, large print, audio, and digital) for students with print disabilities, as required by the IDEA NIMAS. The institute included the use of technology for accessing and creating educational materials in accessible formats. As part of Pacific CIMAP, each FSM LEA was issued a set of equipment, tools, and software to produce the accessible formats in their island communities. Follow-up on-site technical support was provided for each LEA to develop standard operating procedures for maximizing the use of technology and equipment for producing educational materials in accessible formats for students with print disabilities to access the general curriculum.

In February and July 2009, FSM participated in the OSEP-funded PACIFIC Project regional events facilitated by Guam CEDDERS. The February 2009 event focused on the development of a local "cadre" for providing technical support to IEP teams on providing supports to students with significant cognitive disabilities participating in an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAS), which includes supporting instruction for accessing the general curriculum. The July 2009 regional event furthered the cadre development by offering best practices strategies, including the use of Universal Design for Learning (UDL), for students with significant cognitive disabilities to access the general curriculum and improve results in their performance in the AA-AAS.

FSM participated in the July 2009 annual regional Pacific Educational Conference (PEC) held on Guam. The conference offered sessions on effective classroom strategies. The Pacific Response to Intervention (RTI) Initiative facilitated several RTI sessions.

In July 2009, the annual Micronesia Teacher Education Conference (MTEC) was held in Pohnpei. The conference included a variety of sessions, with a focus on developing writing skills of students. In conjunction with MTEC, the Pacific CIMAP offered a Braille Training for regional personnel working with children who are blind. The equipment, tools, and software used to access and create educational materials in accessible formats were reviewed. The Braille Training also featured "hands-on" demonstrations of the technology with children who are blind from Pohnpei. During the MTEC, it was shared that these training opportunities needed to expand to include a series designed specifically for school administrators. This will be targeted for 2009-2010.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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.

'08-'09 Progress: FSM NDOE continues to monitor the provisions of LRE through on-site monitoring of LEA programs and a review of LRE data for Indicator 5 and 618. Each LEA is implementing a local (LEA) monitoring system to review compliance with IDEA requirements on a regular basis, inclusive of the LRE provisions.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-2010:

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

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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 children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

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

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

Measurement:

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

FSM is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.

New Measurement Requirement.

As per OSEP's instructions, in the FFY 2009 submission due February 1, 2011, FSM needs to establish new baseline, targets and, as needed, improvement activities for this Indicator using the 2009-2010 data.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

Measurement:

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes (use for FFY 2008-2009 reporting):

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d) divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e) divided by the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e) times 100.

Refer to FSM's Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) submitted February 1, 2010 for this Indicator.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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
2008 (2008-2009)	75% of parents report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

FSM continues to use the FSM Family Outcome Survey (adapted from the ECO Family Survey) as a means for collecting data from parents of children receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for their children with disabilities. The same survey was used in FFY 2008, as in previous years, and is therefore not attached to this APR. FSM administers the survey to all parents of students with IEPs each year.

FSM reports that of the 1,544 students with IEPs, 802 or 52% of parents responded to the FSM Family Outcome Survey. The following Table provides the percentage of respondents by each FSM State, with the FSM total:

STATE	#Students w/IEPs	#Respondents	%Respondents
Chuuk	551	152	27%
Kosrae	183	142	72%
Pohnpei	666	399	60%
Yap	144	109	69%
Total	1544	802	52%

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;
- 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 involved in your child's education at school.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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	2565	28% (711/2565)	37% (960/2565)	34% (869/2565)	71% (1829/2565)
KOSRAE	2272	8% (186/2272)	25% (597/2272)	67% (1596/2272)	97% (2193/2272)
POHNPEI	6384	21% (1432/6384)	26% (1791/6384)	53% (3566/6384)	84% (5357/6384)
YAP	1785	34% (231/1785)	21% (1305/1785)	45% (307/1785)	90% (1612/1785)
TOTAL	11814	20% (2560/13008)	36% (4653/13006)	49% (6338/13006)	85% (10991/13006)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

FSM met its target of 75% with the combined percentage of responses resulting in 85% performance for FFY 2008. 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?" as performance data for this indicator. Based on the 7-point rating scale a total of 83% (646/783) of parents responded that they "Agree" or "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 75% with a performance of 83%, with a survey response return rate of 52% (802 surveys returned of the 1544 surveys that were distributed). FSM, with input from the stakeholders, determined that using all of the questions from the survey for actual target data would provide a more complete picture of parent involvement. Further, with the response rate ranging from 27% (152/551) to 72% (142/183) in the four FSM states, as shown in the Actual Target Data section, the data reported are representative of FSM's population, especially given the majority population served is the 618 ethnic category of Pacific Islanders.

The NDOE continues to support FSM State specific training for parents. In September 2008, NDOE sponsored the "FSM Parent-Consumer conference" held in Chuuk State. The theme for the conference was "The Challenges of Special Needs Care and Collaboration in the FSM." The Keynote speaker was Hilario Permanes "HP", Junior, an Army veteran who is also a person with disabilities. Representative from each FSM State participated in the conference. As a result, each FSM State conducted parent workshops on the special education process and parent rights with support from their local parent groups. In addition, "Annual Disability Awareness" activities were held in each FSM State with various activities, including training and presentations on the types of disabilities and services for individuals with disabilities. Parents of children with disabilities have also participated in regional events/workshops as part of the FSM State teams.

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.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

'08-'09 Progress: The same survey instrument was used for FFY 2008. In addition, the FSM States are collaborating with Parent Organizations to disseminate and collect the parent surveys. This strategy has been effective and results in an increase in the number of surveys returned.

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

'08-'09 Progress: Survey dissemination process remained the same as FFY 2007, with additional steps taken in Pohnpei to ensure increased participation. The Pohnpei Special Parents Network (PSPN), a non-profit organization for parents of children with disabilities, conducted the parent surveys. This parent-to-parent process for gathering the surveys allowed for parents to feel comfortable with the survey items and their responses. This can be seen in the increased number of surveys completed from 290 in FFY 2007 to 399 in FFY 2008, representing a 38% increase.

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.

'08-'09 Progress: FSM State specific training was conducted in each FSM State facilitated by the Special Education Program and parent groups, such as the PSPN in Pohnpei. During the FSM National parent conference that was held in Chuuk State, parents were provided an opportunity to share the success, barriers, and strategies for improvement during the open forums.

Improvement Activity 4: FSM-NDOE 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.

'08-'09 Progress: Various State-level parent trainings were conducted on topic areas such as, the IEP process, early childhood outcomes, strategies to support their child's development, and parent rights.

In January and March 2009, a total of 174 parents and teachers participated in a 2-day training in Kosrae on compliant, mediation, and due process procedures.

In June 2008, Yap State conducted training with 16 parents on the roles and responsibilities of the IEP team and strategies for supporting their child's development.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-2010:

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

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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."

This Indicator measure is not applicable to FSM.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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."

This Indicator measure is not applicable to FSM.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

Overview of the Annual Performance Report 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 who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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

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

The revised Indicator and measurement language has been incorporated into the updated revised complete FSM SPP and posted on the FSM NDOE websites: <http://www.fsmed.fm> and <http://www.fsmsped.org/dashboard>.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-2009	100% of children with parental consent received for initial evaluation will be evaluated within 60 days.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

Following the measurement requirement for this indicator, the following Table shows data collected from each FSM State LEA for reporting period July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009:

FSM LEA	a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline.	Percent = (b/a) times 100
Chuuk	136	116	85%
Kosrae	40	33	83%
Pohnpei	164	164	100%
Yap	29	16	55%
FSM Total	369	329	89%

There were 369 parental consents for initial evaluation received for this reporting period. Of the 369 parental consents for initial evaluation, 89% (329/369) evaluations were completed within 60 days of receiving the parental consents. FSM has verified that the remaining 40 initial evaluations were completed, although late.

Number and percent of children whose evaluations were completed over the 60-day timeline and the range of days over the timeline for FFY 2008:

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

FSM LEA	(a) Total # of children whose evaluations were completed over the 60-Day Timeline	(b) Range of # Days Over				Total Percent = [(b/a) x 100]
		<30 Days Over	31-60 Days Over	61-90 Days Over	>90 Days Over	
Chuuk	20	0	1	0	19	100% (20/20)
Kosrae	7	0	0	0	7	100% (7/7)
Yap	13	0	0	3	10	100% (13/13)
FSM TOTAL	40	0	1	3	36	100% (40/40)

Data Source: The evaluation data were taken from the LEA LPP and verified through the SITS database system of all children for whom a parental consent to evaluate was received for the report year July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009.

Documentation for Delayed Evaluations: Reasons for Delay by LEAs:

Chuuk: Tracking of paperwork for each step in the special education process wasn't done consistently.

Kosrae: Tracking of paperwork for each step in the special education process wasn't done for one school.

Yap: Case managers submitted all paperwork at one time when all required documents, through the development of an IEP, were completed. This didn't allow for tracking timeline requirements for each step in the special education process.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

FSM demonstrated progress in FFY 2008 with 89% (329/369) performance compared to last year's performance of 83% (214/257). The increase in percentage also represents an increase in the number of initial evaluations completed by 115 (329-214). FSM did not meet the compliance target of 100%.

Verification of Correction of FFY 2008 Noncompliance, Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02

As indicated in the actual target data for FFY 2008, FSM verified the 40 initial evaluations that didn't meet the 60-day timeline were completed. Findings of noncompliance were made with the three LEAs (Chuuk, Kosrae, and Yap) that did not demonstrate compliance with this indicator in their LPP. The review of issues and corrective actions taken to address the noncompliance included the following:

Chuuk: In May 2009, the newly hired special education coordinator provided the critical leadership needed to organize and supervise the follow-through needed for all intakes, referrals, and parental consents received to move along within the required timelines of the special education process. As reported in the December 2009 FSM Grant Special Conditions Report submitted to OSEP, significant evidence has been provided by Chuuk that ensures a system for accounting for "intakes" to be addressed, which could require a parent consent for initial evaluation, is in place. Chuuk was able to demonstrate the changes in procedures for tracking all individual student concerns raised and parent consent to evaluate received through evaluation completed within the required 60-day timeline.

Kosrae: From August 2009-December 2009, 23 referrals were received for the school that didn't meet the 60-day timeline in FFY 2008. All 23 referrals received parent consent with the evaluation completed within the 60-day timeline requirement. The review of additional data from the one school that didn't meet the timeline requirement in FFY 2008 demonstrated verified correction of the 60-day timeline noncompliance. This also indicates that Kosrae is able to correctly implement the specific requirements for meeting the 60-day timeline.

Yap: A supervisor was assigned to each zone: Waab and Neighboring Islands (NI). Beginning school year 2009-2010, a change in submission of paperwork was implemented so that each step in the special education process from referral, parent consent, evaluation, eligibility, IEP, and Placement can be tracked for timely completion. The review of the additional data from Yap, in particular the schools that didn't

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

meet the timeline in FFY 2008, demonstrated that 17 of 17 evaluations for which parental consent was received following the implementation of the above corrective actions were completed within 60 days. Based on this data, FSM verified correction of the 60-day timeline noncompliance. This data indicated that Yap is able to correctly implement the specific requirements for meeting the 60-day timeline, as required by OSEP Memo 09-02.

Neither Yap nor Kosrae met the 60-day timeline in FFY 2007 and FFY 2008. Chuuk did not meet the 60-day timeline in FFY 2008. However, because of the specific actions taken, such as assigning personnel to track the process and hiring a new special education coordinator, FSM is confident that Yap, Kosrae, and Chuuk will be able to submit data demonstrating that they are implementing the specific regulation of the 60-day timeline within one year from the date of the identification of the noncompliance. FSM will report on the correction of these FFY 2008 findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.

OSEP Response Table, June 1, 2009

FSM reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely initial evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected.

FSM must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that FSM is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance FSM reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. FSM must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each State with noncompliance reported by FSM under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has completed the initial evaluation, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the State, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). If FSM is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, FSM must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.

OSEP notes that FSM must make findings of noncompliance based on each year's data regardless of the status of the correction of the previous year's noncompliance. See Frequently Asked Questions Regarding Identification and Correction of Noncompliance and Reporting on Correction in the State Performance Plan(SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR), dated Sept 3, 2008 (FAQ dated 9/3/2008).

FSM's Response to OSEP Response Table, June 1, 2009

Verification of Correction of Noncompliance in FFY 2007 APR, Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02

Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, FSM ensures that each LEA has completed the initial evaluation, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the State, for all 43 children for whom noncompliance was identified in FFY 2007 under this indicator.

Correction of FFY 2007 Noncompliance

FFY	(a) # of Evals Over Timeline	(b) # of Evals Completed	Percent & Total Number (Percent =b/a x 100)
2007	43	43	100% (43/43)

The 43 initial evaluations that didn't meet the 60-day timeline included 18 from Kosrae and 25 from Yap. Findings of noncompliance were issued to Kosrae and Yap for not meeting the 60-day initial evaluation timeline, as reported in Indicator 15B Worksheet of this APR.

In addition to ensuring correction for each individual instance, FSM also collected progress data to ensure that Kosrae and Yap were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements related to timely evaluations. Kosrae reported progress data from July 2008 to September 2008. Of the 10 referrals with consent to evaluate received by Kosrae, all 10 evaluations were completed within 60 days. Yap State

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

reported progress data from January 2008 through January 2009, with 6 new referrals with parent consent to evaluate and all 6 completed within the 60-day timeline.

Based on this data collected subsequent to the implementation of corrective actions, including redefining roles and responsibilities of critical related service personnel under a new administration, FSM verified, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, that both findings of noncompliance (Kosrae and Yap) identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.

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 *Continuous Improvement Monitoring System*, with a focus on monitoring identification percentages in the early grades, through LEA quarterly reports and fiscal reports to FSM-NDOE and the FSM-NDOE 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.

'08-'09 Progress: FSM NDOE continues to implement on-site monitoring visits and reviews of LEA quarterly reports to monitor for compliance with Indicator 11 requirements. Refer to Indicator 15 for description of FSM's monitoring activities.

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.

'08-'09 Progress: FSM NDOE provided on-site technical assistance support, especially to Chuuk, on the Child Find requirements. In addition, Child Find activities are discussed during the FSM special education coordinators meetings and the FSM National SPP/APR Committee meetings.

Improvement Activity 3: New for 2008-2009: 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.

'08-'09 Progress: Yap State received technical assistance and training on the special education procedures, including the development and implementation of a case management review process. In FFY 2009, a local monitoring system will be developed to align with the FSM NDOE monitoring visit procedures and review.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-2010: This is a compliance indicator therefore targets will not be adjusted.

FSM will continue to implement and monitor the improvement activities on an annual basis to ensure compliance for this indicator.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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 (LEA notified pursuant to IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A) for Part B 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.
- e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

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

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

This Indicator measure is not applicable to FSM. FSM does not receive Part C funding.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008 (2008-2009)	Reporting Not Required.

FSM provides the following information and data to address the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2007 APR for this Indicator, as required by OSEP:

OSEP Response Table, June 2009

FSM reported noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was partially corrected.

Although FSM is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, FSM must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by FSM under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. FSM must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each State with noncompliance reported by FSM under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for each youth, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the State, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

The State reported that the remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was partially corrected. OSEP notes that FSM must make findings of noncompliance based on each year's data regardless of the status of the correction of the previous year's noncompliance. See FAQ dated 9/3/2008.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

FSM's Response to OSEP Response Table, June 2009

Verification of Correction of FFY 2004 Noncompliance, Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02

FSM has verified that the remaining FFY 2004 noncompliance identified for Pohnpei State has been corrected. FSM verified that all individual instances of noncompliance were corrected, as reported in the LEA quarterly reports and verified through an on-site monitoring conducted in September 2009. FSM also reviewed data from a subsequent quarterly report that showed that Pohnpei State was correctly implementing the specific secondary transition requirements for one quarter.

The identified noncompliance for Indicator 13 was issued in FFY 2004. FSM did not identify Indicator 13 as a finding of noncompliance for FFY 2005 because the identified noncompliance in FFY 2004 for the secondary transition requirement was not corrected in FFY 2005. Therefore, verification of correction specific to Pohnpei was reported as an identified noncompliance for Indicator 13 for FFY 2004, which was reflected in the FFY 2006 APR as a "previously identified" noncompliance.

Verification of Correction of FFY 2007 Noncompliance, Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02

FFY Report Period	(a) # of IEPs Reported without Secondary Transition Requirements	(b) # of IEPs FSM Verified as Corrected Completed with Secondary Transition Requirements as of June 2009
2007	145	145

As demonstrated in the table above, FSM has verified that all individual instances of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected. In addition, FSM has reviewed subsequent data from each LEA state with the noncompliance to ensure that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific secondary transition requirements.

Chuuk: In FFY 2007, Chuuk reported 2 individual instances of noncompliance related to Indicator 13 requirements. During the FSM NDOE follow-up on-site visit in April 2009, FSM NDOE verified that the 2 IEPs were corrected. Further, as reported under Indicator 11, with the newly hired special education coordinator provided the critical leadership needed to organize and supervise the special education program.

Pohnpei: In FFY 2007, Pohnpei reported 119 individual instances of noncompliance related to Indicator 13 requirements. As noted in the verified correction of the FFY 2005 noncompliance specific to Pohnpei, through subsequent reporting, Pohnpei was able to demonstrate 100% compliance with this requirement, including the correction of the 119 instances of noncompliance reported in FFY 2007.

Yap: In FFY 2007, Yap reported 24 individual instances of noncompliance related to Indicator 13. FSM NDOE verified correction through Yap's quarterly report and during the FSM NDOE on-site monitoring visit conducted in December 2008. Further, during the review of additional IEP files conducted during the FSM NDOE on-site monitoring, FSM NDOE did not identify Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements as a finding of noncompliance.

The following describes FSM's progress on the following improvement activities:

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

'08-'09 Progress: Completed in 2007-2008.

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

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

'08-'09 Progress: In January 2009, FSM participated in a regional Secondary Transition Workshop conducted by Dr. Ed O'leary and the Western Regional Resource Center (WRRC) on Guam. The 2-day workshop provided guidance and support for meeting the secondary transition requirements. As a result, each LEA conducted local training related to the secondary transition requirements.

In June 2009, FSM National hired a secondary transition specialist to facilitate National training activities related to secondary transition, which would include priorities established for SPP Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14.

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

'08-'09 Progress: In June and August 2009, FSM consulted with the National Center on Post-School Outcomes (NPSO) on the SITS data elements for the secondary transition requirements and the new definition for post-school outcomes.

A field in the SITS has been created to capture whether the student has an Individualized Transition Plan (ITP) which includes the 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, Parents, Consumer/ Student Trainees, College representatives, Chamber of Commerce representatives, Business Organizations, and others.

'08-'09 Progress: Refer to progress noted for Improvement Activities 2 and 3.

Improvement Activity 5: New for 2008-2009. 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: SpEd Transition staff, Support from FSM NDOE

'08-'09 Progress: Training scheduled for the week of March 29, 2010 in Chuuk for Secondary Transition teachers from all four FSM states. This training will cover the additional requirements and new definitions that need to be incorporated into the transition manual. In addition, the data collection process will be reviewed and revised to ensure it captures and report data in a timely manner consistent with SITS. Technical assistance will be provided by Center on Disabilities Studies, University of Hawaii.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-2010: This is a compliance indicator therefore targets will not be adjusted.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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 are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

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

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

FSM is not required to report on this Indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.

New Measurement Requirement.

As per OSEP's instructions, in the FFY 2009 submission due February 1, 2011, FSM needs to establish new baseline, targets and, as needed, improvement activities for this Indicator.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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.
- States are required to use the "Indicator 15 Worksheet" to report data for this indicator (see Attachment A).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of FSM's 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.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

Actual Target for 2008-2009	100% (10/10) of FSM's 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.
------------------------------------	--

As a unitary system, FSM receives IDEA Part B funds to support the delivery of special education and related services in the FSM. Given FSM's unique geographic context, NDOE has established a general supervision structure similar to a State Education Agency (SEA) and Local Education Agency (LEA) structure for administering, supervising, and monitoring the implementation of the IDEA requirements. 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 instructed, FSM utilized the OSEP B15 Worksheet to document the verified correction of findings noncompliance identified in FFY 2007.

PART B INDICATOR 15 WORKSHEET

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEA Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. 2. Percent of youth with IEPs	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site	0	0	0

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEA Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
dropping out of high school. 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.	Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments. 7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
4A. Percent of districts identified 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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 -educational placements. 6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	1	1	1
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification. 10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	Not Applicable to FSM.		
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	Not Applicable to FSM.		
11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	2	2	2
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	Not Applicable to FSM.		
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	Not Applicable to FSM.		
13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable student to meet	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	3	3	3

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEA Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
the post-secondary goals.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
Other areas of noncompliance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline for Initial IEP Completion • Advisory Council Membership • Fiscal Management • Interagency Agreement 	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	1	4	4
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			10	10
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.			100% (10/10)	

In FFY 2007, the annual on-site NDOE monitoring/verification visit and data review for the APR compliance indicators served as FSM's sources for identifying noncompliance. NDOE conducted a monitoring/verification visit to Kosrae State which resulted in findings of noncompliance. The annual review of data for APR compliance Indicators 11 and 13, resulted in findings of noncompliance made to Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap, as discussed in the respective Indicators.

FSM NDOE did not receive any formal complaints or due process requests in FFY 2007.

It should be noted that NDOE conducted on-site focused monitoring visits to Chuuk State in December 2007 and March 2008 to verify correction of the 2006 OSEP findings of noncompliance. The status of the Chuuk-specific noncompliance was reported in the July 2008 NDOE report to OSEP, the February 2009 FSM FFY 2007 APR, and more recently, the December 2009 FSM Grant Special Conditions Report. FSM provides the required "status" information for the Chuuk-specific noncompliance within the Discussion section of this Indicator.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

Based on the B15 Worksheet, FSM reports 100% compliance with Indicator 15, which represents progress from last year's 75% (6/8) performance. The breakdown of verified timely correction as follows:

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance Timely Corrected (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance FSM made during FFY 2007 (the period from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator B15 Worksheet)	10
2. Number of findings FSM verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding) (Sum of Column b on the Indicator B15 Worksheet)	10
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

Verification of Timely Correction. Five (5) findings of noncompliance were as a result of NDOE's monitoring/verification on-site visit to Kosrae State. These findings were listed under Indicator 5 and "Other" in the B15 Worksheet. Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, NDOE verified timely correction of the FFY 2007 findings of noncompliance through Kosrae's quarterly progress report to NDOE. FSM reports that Kosrae provided evidence that it (1) was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, and (2) corrected all instances of noncompliance.

Verification of correction of findings on noncompliance made to Kosrae included:

- **Indicator 5: Finding:** Transportation services for home services were not fully delivered because 1 of the 2 vehicles was not operational. **Correction:** An interim plan was developed and implemented during the NDOE visit for addressing the transportation requirements while the vehicle was being fixed. Kosrae provided additional information documenting that transportation services were being provided on a consistent basis.
- **Other:**
 - **Timeline for Initial IEP Completion: Finding:** 30-day timeline for Initial IEP was not met. **Correction:** Kosrae completed the initial IEP in noncompliance and NDOE verified correction through a review of additional data from the quarterly report and database. In addition, Kosrae implemented a weekly case review procedure for tracking timeline requirements.
 - **Advisory Council Membership: Finding:** Membership did not include majority (50% plus 1) parents of children with disabilities and individuals with disabilities. **Correction:** Kosrae provided evidence of the correct membership composition.
 - **Fiscal Management: Finding:** Fiscal procedures for providing full justification for all procurement and travel associated with special education funding. **Correction:** Kosrae provided evidence of a fiscal management workshop being held and evidence of internal procedural and documentation changes, and current documentation showing full justifications.
 - **Interagency Agreement: Finding:** Kosrae's Interagency Agreement was not updated. **Correction:** Kosrae provided NDOE a copy of the signed Kosrae Interagency Agreement effective January 2009, which prioritizes the coordination and implementation of early identification with specific referral procedures to ensure timely identification, evaluation, and as appropriate, development and implementation of an IEP for providing special education and related services. Kosrae also reported the schedule and discussion items for the Interagency/Advisory meetings.

The other 5 findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2007 related to Indicators 11 and 13. One (1) finding of noncompliance was made to Kosrae and 1 to Yap for not meeting the 60-day timeline requirement identified through the annual reporting under Indicator 11. One finding of noncompliance was made to Chuuk, 1 to Pohnpei, and 1 to Yap for not meeting the secondary transition requirements identified through the annual reporting under Indicator 13. A detailed description of NDOE's verification of correction of those findings of noncompliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, is provided within Indicators 11 and 13.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2006 Findings of Noncompliance

1. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings noted in OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 APR response table for this indicator	2
2. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings FSM has verified as corrected	2
3. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings FSM has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

FSM verified subsequent correction of the remaining FFY 2006 findings of noncompliance. These findings were made to Chuuk and Pohnpei for not meeting the annual IEP reviews. FSM NDOE verified correction consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In both Chuuk and Pohnpei, FSM ensured that all IEP reviews that were not conducted within timelines were conducted, although late. In addition, NDOE

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

reviewed current data to ensure that annual IEP reviews were being conducted timely. The results of those reviews showed:

Chuuk: In January 2010, NDOE verified that the 16 IEP files reviewed for completeness in January and April 2009 were corrected and continues to be current. These additional data showed 100% (16/16) compliance from 75% (12/16) in the initial reviews done in January and April 2009.

Pohnpei: In September 2009, FSM NDOE conducted an on-site monitoring/verification visit, which included a review of IEP files for completeness. The review of IEP files resulted in no findings made in the area of annual reviews.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2004 Findings of Noncompliance

1. Number of remaining FFY 2004 findings noted in OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 APR response table for this indicator	1
2. Number of remaining FFY 2004 findings FSM has verified as corrected	1
3. Number of remaining FFY 2004 findings FSM has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

FSM NDOE verified subsequent correction of the remaining FFY 2004 findings of noncompliance. As reported in the FFY 2007 APR, Pohnpei demonstrated partial correction for not meeting the secondary requirements under Indicator 13. As discussed in Indicator 13 of this APR, FSM NDOE was able to verify that Pohnpei demonstrated subsequent correction of the secondary requirements.

OSEP Response Table, June 2009

FSM must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that it has corrected the remaining findings of noncompliance identified in the FFY 2004 and FFY 2006 APRs and OSEP's July 17, 2007 verification letter that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2007 APR.

FSM's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of FSM's general supervision systems. FSM must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that it has corrected this noncompliance.

FSM must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable FSM to provide data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that FSM timely corrected noncompliance identified by FSM in FFY 2007 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e) and OSEP Memo 09-02.

In reporting on correction of noncompliance, FSM must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through FSM's monitoring system, through FSM's data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that each State with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, FSM must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.

In addition, in responding to Indicators 11 and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, FSM must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.

FSM's Response to OSEP Response Table, June 2009

As reported within this Discussion section, FSM reports subsequent correction of the noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2004 and FFY 2006. As instructed, FSM reported verified timely correction of the FFY 2007 findings of noncompliance through the annual data review for Indicators 11 and 13 within

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

the respective Indicators of this APR.

In addition, FSM has reviewed its improvement activities to ensure that they will allow FSM NDOE to continue to verify correction of all identified noncompliance within one year of identification.

OSEP Response Table, June 2009, WITH FSM's Response for the July 2007 Verification Letter

OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table also required FSM to provide information in its final report due July 17, 2008 and in its FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, addressing the following issues related to OSEP's July 17, 2007 verification letter:

OSEP Response Statement	FSM's Response
<p>(1) correction of the following noncompliance identified by FSM in Chuuk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 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 34 CFR §300.111; b) 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); c) 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>FSM provided a progress report addressing these areas of noncompliance. FSM reported correction of the noncompliance related to timely initial evaluations in Chuuk.</p> <p>In its FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2009, FSM must submit data demonstrating compliance with 34 CFR §§300.111; 300.114; 300.115 and 300.116, including a description of the process used to ensure consistent implementation of the revised Child Find Plan and weekly case review process, data on the percentage of IEPs reviewed that included justifications for the IEP Team placement decisions, and information on whether a continuum of alternative placements is available in Chuuk.</p>	<p>Refer to FSM Part B FFY 2008 APR, Indicator 15, Attachment A for FSM's response.</p>
<p>(2) correction of noncompliance in Chuuk in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Chuuk's implementation of FSM-NDOE's procedures for providing a free appropriate public education to all children with disabilities as required by 34 CFR §300.101(a). b) children with disabilities who are homebound have an IEP in accordance with the requirements at 34 CFR §§300.320 through 300.328, including 	<p>Refer to FSM Part B FFY 2008 APR, Indicator 15, Attachment A for FSM's response.</p> <p>As per the follow-up to OSEP's March 5, 2010 response to FSM's First Progress Report, FSM will address whether the states are following the FSM procedures and the determination of sufficient homebound teachers in Chuuk in FSM's Final Progress Report due to OSEP in May 2010.</p>

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

<p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table also required FSM to provide information in its final report due July 17, 2008 and in its FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, addressing the following issues related to OSEP's July 17, 2007 verification letter:</p>	
OSEP Response Statement	FSM's Response
<p>that IEPs include a statement of the 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>c) there are sufficient homebound teachers to provide needed academic services as required by 34 CFR §§300.101(a), 300.323(c) and 300.156.</p> <p>d) 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); 300.34(c)(16) and 300.101(a).</p> <p>FSM provided a progress report addressing these areas of noncompliance.</p> <p>FSM must submit a report demonstrating compliance with these requirements with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010. The report must include updated data and information demonstrating compliance with 34 CFR §§300.17; 300.34(2); 300.34.(c)(16) and 300.101(a) including whether transportation services are provided to all children with disabilities who require such services to benefit from special education, and whether the number of personnel who provide homebound special education and related services is sufficient to meet the requirements in the IEPs of the children who received these services.</p>	
<p>(3) FSM reviewed with the special education staff of Chuuk all IEPs to ensure that they were developed in accordance with Part B requirements at 34 CFR §§300.320 through 300.328 and that evaluations have been completed in accordance with the requirements at 34 CFR §§300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>FSM did not provide the required information. In its FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, FSM must submit data demonstrating compliance with 34 CFR §§300.320 through 300.328 and §§300.301 through 300.311. The report must include: (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; (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 also report on whether the IEPs reviewed met all IEP requirements.</p>	<p>Refer to <u>FSM Part B FFY 2008 APR, Indicator 15, Attachment A</u> for FSM's response.</p>
<p>(4) 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). <u>FSM provided the required</u></p>	<p>FSM provided the required information in the FFY 2007 APR.</p>

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

<p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table also required FSM to provide information in its final report due July 17, 2008 and in its FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, addressing the following issues related to OSEP's July 17, 2007 verification letter:</p>	
OSEP Response Statement	FSM's Response
<p>information.</p>	
<p>(5) FSM is correcting noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the date that FSM identifies noncompliance.</p> <p>FSM provided progress data addressing this area of noncompliance. In its FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, FSM must provide data indicating that 100% of noncompliance is corrected in a timely manner. In addition, FSM must submit with its FFY 2008 APR a copy of its monitoring procedures that specifically address the correction of noncompliance as soon as possible, but not later than one year from the date that FSM identifies noncompliance.</p>	<p>Refer to <u>FSM Part B FFY 2008 APR, Indicator 15, Attachment A</u> for FSM's response.</p> <p>As per the follow-up to OSEP's March 5, 2010 response to FSM's First Progress Report, FSM will address updated monitoring procedures that incorporates OSEP's 09-02 memorandum in FSM's Final Progress Report due to OSEP in May 2010.</p>
<p>(6) The dates and topics of training provided to special education and related services staff in Chuuk. <u>FSM provided the required information.</u></p>	<p>FSM provided the required information in the FFY 2007 APR.</p>
<p>(7) FSM reviewed 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), and copies of any final interagency agreements.</p> <p>FSM did not provide a copy of the Interagency Agreement as required by OSEP. FSM must submit a copy of the revised National Interagency Agreement with its FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>	<p>Refer to <u>FSM Part B FFY 2008 APR, Indicator 15, Attachment A</u> for FSM's response.</p>
<p>(8) FSM is implementing the revised Student Information Tracking System (SITS) and training staff about the revised system. <u>FSM provided the required information.</u></p>	<p>FSM provided the required information in the FFY 2007 APR.</p>
<p>(9) FSM is accurately identifying and reporting data on children with disabilities in Chuuk. <u>FSM provided the required information.</u></p>	<p>FSM provided the required information in the FFY 2007 APR.</p>
<p>(10) FSM is distributing its written procedures to parents, with a copy of the procedures to be provided to OSEP. <u>FSM provided the required information.</u></p>	<p>FSM provided the required information in the FFY 2007 APR.</p>
<p>(11) FSM is in compliance with requirements related to the fiscal management of Part B funds in Chuuk, and the results of on-site and off-site fiscal audits of Chuuk, including:</p> <p>a) written procedures to ensure that Chuuk complies with FSM national procurement</p>	<p>Refer to <u>FSM Part B FFY 2008 APR, Indicator 15, Attachment A</u> for FSM's response.</p> <p>As per the follow-up to OSEP's March 5, 2010 response to FSM's First Progress Report, FSM will address the Fiscal Management Plan requirement in FSM's Final</p>

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table also required FSM to provide information in its final report due July 17, 2008 and in its FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, addressing the following issues related to OSEP's July 17, 2007 verification letter:

OSEP Response Statement	FSM's Response
<p>requirements and Federal procurement requirements applicable to the Part B program, including procurement requirements in OMB Circular A-87, OMB Circular A-102 and 34 CFR Part 80, Subpart C. The procedures should include how Chuuk will maintain: (a) separate accounting records for special education expenses; (b) all documents related to procurements; and (c) a paper trail to justify expenses paid with Part B funds (including reimbursements for expenses related to the provision of special education and related services for children with disabilities);</p> <p>b) procedures for auditing the use of Part B funds in Chuuk;</p> <p>c) proposed timelines for FSM-NDOE to audit the use of Part B funds in Chuuk;</p> <p>d) a plan for providing training to staff in Chuuk about appropriate accounting and procurement procedures; and</p> <p>e) data and information regarding the progress of the fiscal management of Part B funds in Chuuk, including the results of on-site fiscal audits.</p> <p>In its FFY 2008 APR due, February 1, 2010, FSM must provide information demonstrating implementation of FSM's Fiscal Management Plan, including updated data and information regarding the fiscal management of Part B funds in Chuuk, the results of on-site and off-site fiscal audits of Chuuk, and outcomes of the Fiscal Management training.</p>	<p>Progress Report due to OSEP in May 2010.</p>

FSM's General Supervision System

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

NDOE, the SEA, has developed and implemented a *Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS)* as an ongoing mechanism to assess the impact of special education and related services on improving results for children with disabilities in the FSM. The SEA revised the monitoring system to assess compliance and performance of each LEA based on IDEA 2004, the Part B regulations, and FSM Public Law 14-08 of June 2005. FSM Public Law 14-08 provided the amendments to FSM Public Law 8-21 of 1993 ensuring policy alignment with IDEA. Aligned with OSEP's *Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring System (CIFMS)*, the FSM *Continuous Improvement Monitoring System* includes two processes for identifying compliance and performance of each LEA utilizing the IDEA Part B SPP indicators and measurements and related IDEA requirements.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

Identification of Noncompliance

The annual on-site monitoring/verification visit, through the documented evidence gathered from the use of the monitoring system instruments, the LEA Verification Checklist and the Child Record Review Checklist, has been NDOE's primary source for identifying noncompliance. As a result of the on-site visit and review of all physical evidence, a written SEA Monitoring/Verification Report is provided to the LEA. The Monitoring/Verification Report serves as the point of identification for noncompliance requiring correction by the LEA as soon as possible but no later than one year from the date of the Report.

During the 2009-2010 reporting year, monitoring activities will include expanded off-site monitoring activities. Specifically the review of the quarterly progress reports and the systematic analysis of the data from the Student Information Tracking System (SITS) will be piloted. The 2nd and 4th quarter reporting period will be designated as sources of data for identifying noncompliance. This bi-annual review, beginning January 2010, will utilize the quarterly reports to identify noncompliance related to IDEA Part B SPP compliance indicators 11 and 13, and the SITS data system to identify noncompliance for the annual IEP review and re-evaluation requirements. This pilot year will provide guidance on the procedures for inclusion into the revisions to the SEA monitoring procedures.

Correction of Noncompliance

The NDOE Monitoring/Verification Report serves as the point of identification for noncompliance requiring correction by the LEA no later than one year from the date of the Report. For NDOE (SEA), monitoring reports with corrective actions are always designed to encourage correction of noncompliance as soon as possible. Corrective actions will often specify timelines for correction that require documentation within Quarterly Progress Reports sooner than one year. The quarterly reports include documentation that any individual instances of noncompliance have been corrected or that if not possible (for timeline noncompliance), children have received the evaluation or IEP although not within timelines in addition to including updated data, reported by quarter, that demonstrate whether each LEA is correctly implementing the specific requirements.

A finding of noncompliance is determined to be corrected when the LEA submits documentation, usually within a Quarterly Progress Report, to notify the NDOE that the finding of noncompliance has been corrected and NDOE verifies correction. NDOE reviews the documentation and decides what level of verification of correction will be needed. The documentation of correction of noncompliance is verified by review of records, such as the quarterly progress reports for updated data demonstrating compliance, and if necessary on-site physical review of evidence confirming that each instance of noncompliance has been corrected. All corrected areas of noncompliance are also reviewed during the annual on-site verification monitoring visit for each LEA. The FSM SITS database will also be used beginning January 2010 to corroborate reports of correction of noncompliance.

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

The November 2009 OSEP on-site verification and monitoring visit to the FSM provided an opportunity for FSM to re-visit the monitoring procedures. Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, the identification and verification of correction processes are in place. The CrEAG reviews provided additional support to FSM in updating the monitoring procedures. As indicated under the CrEAG General Supervision System section, in January 2010, FSM NDOE will begin incorporating a data system review monitoring activity for identifying and making findings of noncompliance.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-2010: This is a compliance target therefore targets will not be adjusted. Refinement of the monitoring procedures will continue in FFY 2009.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-2009	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to particular complaint.

The revised Indicator and measurement language has been incorporated into the updated revised complete FSM SPP and posted on the FSM NDOE websites: <http://www.fsmed.fm> and <http://www.fmsped.org/dashboard>.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

FSM did not receive any signed written complaints in 2008-2009.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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 adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008 (2008-2009)	100% 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.

The revised Indicator and measurement language has been incorporated into the updated revised complete FSM SPP and posted on the FSM NDOE websites: <http://www.fsmed.fm> and <http://www.fsmsped.org/dashboard>.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

FSM did not receive due process hearing requests in FFY 2008.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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
2008 (2008-2009)	Targets will be set once required baseline data available (10 or greater).

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

FSM did not receive hearing requests in 2008-2009.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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
2008 (2008-2009)	Targets will be set once required baseline data available (10 or greater).

Actual Target Data for 2008-2009:

FSM did not receive requests for hearings or mediations in 2008-2009.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

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 dispute resolution; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports and assessment); and
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008 (2008-2009)	100% FSM reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

FSM used OSEP's Data Rubric to determine the percentage of accurate and reliable data as. FSM data report 100% accuracy and all reports submitted on or before the due date.

SPP/APR Data - Indicator 20			
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
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	N/A	N/A	0
14	N/A	N/A	0
15	1	1	2
16	1	1	2
17	1	1	2
18	1	1	2
19	1	1	2
		Subtotal	26
APR Score Calculation		Timely Submission Points - If the FFY2008 APR was submitted on time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
		Grand Total - (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	31

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

618 Data - Indicator 20					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Table 1 - Child Count Due Date: 2/1/09	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 - Personnel Due Date: 11/1/09	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 3 - Ed. Environments Due Date: 2/1/09	1	1	1	1	4
Table 4 - Exiting Due Date: 11/1/09	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 5 - Discipline Due Date: 11/1/09	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 6 - State Assessment Due Date: 2/1/10	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
Table 7 - Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/09	1	1	1	N/A	3
				Subtotal	21
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X1.857)=		39

Indicator #20 Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	31
B. 618 Grand Total	39
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	70
Total N/A in APR	12
Total N/A in 618	7
Base	70
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base) =	70/70
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100%

For Measurement A: FSM completed and submit all data reports and APR in a timely manner.

For Measurement B: FSM used OSEP’s rubric to calculate the accuracy of its data submission. In reporting accuracy for APR Indicators, it should be noted that Indicators 3A, 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to FSM; thus, 8 cells do not apply to the FSM, which made the APR denominator “31.”

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

FSM reports 100% (70/70) compliance with Indicator 20, which represents progress from last year’s OSEP recalculated data of 91%. FSM ensures that the data are valid and reliable and has implemented measures to review for accuracy. FSM uses the Student Information Tracking System (SITS) which is a web-based system for all special education student and personnel data.

The SITS is designed to systematically generate reports from the data that are inputted by the LEAs. Prior to data entry into the SITS, the LEAs will review each data element for completeness and accuracy during staff case review meetings. The FSM NDOE reviews data for any unusual variations in data of 10% or more on the Tables.

Each LEA submits a quarterly report that includes data on each Indicator. Currently, the LEAs submit their data to NDOE using the DAC 618 Templates.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

One of the methods for the SEA to ensure that data collection processes reflect the actual practice is the review of the data management procedures and the 618 data submissions during the on-site verification monitoring visits. Part of each verification visit is the review of a sample of student records. The review of records is checked against SITS data. The SEA also reviews the data collection processes as described in the LPP with the data reported in the quarterly progress reports. The LEAs must provide clarification and justification for 10% variation on their reported data.

During the November 2009 OSEP verification and monitoring on-site visit to FSM, a SITS demonstration was conducted to show the specifics of the system and how the web-based capability has assisted NDOE in gathering and verifying special education data from the 4 LEAs, with 3 of the 4 LEAs geographically located on different islands in the Western Pacific.

OSEP Response Table, June 2009

FSM must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable FSM to provide data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that FSM is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, FSM must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.

FSM's Response to OSEP Response Table, June 2009

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

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.

'08-'09 Progress: A new version (2.20) of SITS application was released in March 2009 with new components and an updated user manual. The FSM Special Education website (www.fsmsped.org/dashboard) was also created to show the special education data to the public.

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.

'08-'09 Progress: In March 2009, on-site installation and training of the new version of SITS was conducted in each LEA. Additional training was conducted in November 2009 on the SITS application, website, dashboard, and 618 tables was conducted for all LEA data managers/clerks and coordinators. A demonstration on these new components was also done during the November 2009 OSEP verification visit.

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

'08-'09 Progress: Activity completed in 2007-2008.

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.

'08-'09 Progress: As a result of NDOE on-site monitoring visits, the LEAs created Case Management Review Procedures to ensure completeness and accuracy

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-2009

of data prior to inputting into the SITS. As part of the review process, the LEAs conduct case review meetings to review student IEP records.

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 Management Information System (EMIS) by September 2008.

'08-'09 Progress:

Deleted for 2009-2010. FSM NDOE ensures accuracy of the SITS database in collecting and reporting special education data. The feasibility of integrating SITS with EMIS is not viable at this time. As reported, the LEAs use PEDMS to collect data for the 20 indicators for JEMCO. The PEDMS is an excel database. The data collected through PEDMS related to special education include enrollment, attendance, graduation, assessment, drop-out, and suspension. The LEAs submit their data via "hard" copy to National Education Office for input into EMIS, an access application database. NDOE is in the process of interfacing PEDMS with EMIS, but has not done so as a system. The application of excel to access can be done, but has not been done.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-2010: This is a compliance indicator therefore targets will not be adjusted.

FSM will continue to implement the improvement activities to ensure compliance with this indicator requirement.