

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

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 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 LEAs.

As the SEA, NDOE collected the data for and facilitated the development of the 2011-2012 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 June 2012-September 2012, each LEA convened their special education advisory panel for the development of their IDEA Part B LPP for school year 2012-2013. 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 FFY 2011 data for each SPP/LPP Indicator to establish improvement priorities for school year 2012-2013. In addition, the SPP/APR requirements, with a copy of the OSEP Determination Letter and Response Table, dated June 27, 2012, was shared as a review of the 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 is comprised of agency representatives, parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, community representatives, and LEA Department of Education representatives, including special education personnel.

OSEP FFY 2010 APR Determination Letter, June 2012

As noted in the letter, FSM's determinations for FFYs 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009 were also needs assistance. In accordance with section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 CFR §300.604(a), if a State is determined to need assistance for two consecutive years, the Secretary must take one or more of the following actions: (1) advise the State of available sources of technical assistance that may help the State address the areas in which the State needs assistance; (2) direct the use of State-level funds on the area or areas in which the State needs assistance; or (3) identify the State as a high-risk grantee and impose Special Conditions on the State's Part B grant award.

Pursuant to these requirements, the Secretary is advising FSM of available sources of technical assistance related to FSM's fiscal management of IDEA funds. FSM must work with the OSEP-designated audit facilitator and the technical assistance provider that it selects to substantially address all outstanding audits including its single State audits. Technical assistance related to FSM's financial management system is available through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)/Fiscal Priority Team and the Western Regional Resource Center.

As required by section 616(e)(7) of the IDEA and 34 CFR §300.606, FSM must notify the public within FSM that the Secretary of Education has taken the above enforcement action, including, at a minimum, by posting a public notice on the agency's Web site and distributing the notice to the media and through public agencies.

In response to the June 2012 Determination Letter, FSM provides the following information regarding technical assistance (TA) accessed, actions taken, and notice provided to the public related to the USDOE Secretary's enforcement action above:

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

(1) Technical Assistance Sources Accessed

Technical assistance was received from the OSEP-designated audit facilitator, OSEP State Contact, San Diego State University (SDSU) Interwork Institute, and the University of Guam CEDDERS. During the IDEA Conference in August 2012, FSM, with Guam CEDDERS, met with the OSEP-designated audit facilitator and OSEP State Contact to review the specific requirements of the Secretary's determination. FSM continued communication via e-mail with the OSEP-designated facilitator to address all outstanding audits. FSM also accessed technical assistance from the Western Regional Resource Center (WRRC) through participation in the October 2012 WRRC regional meeting in Oregon.

(2) Actions Taken as a Result of the Technical Assistance Received

FSM provided the required documents to the OSEP-designated audit facilitator to resolve 2003-2004, 2005-2006, and 2006-2007 audit findings. In addition, FSM provided all required documents to address the 2009-2010 audit finding, resulting in OSEP issuing the August 29, 2012 Program Determination Letter (PDL) closing the 2009-2010 audit finding.

FSM is completing the required actions for the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 audit findings based on OSEP's September 28, 2011 PDL. FSM NDOE has provided a copy of OSEP's PDL to FSM Department of Finance to address the required actions for resolving the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 audit findings. FSM NDOE will continue to follow-up with FSM Department of Finance to bring resolution to the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 audit findings.

(3) Notification to the Public of the USDOE Secretary's Enforcement Action

As required, FSM posted the USDOE Secretary's June 27, 2012 Determination Letter on the FSM NDOE websites: <http://www.fsmed.fm> and <http://www.fsmsped.org/dashboard>. In addition, the June 27, 2012 Determination Letter was disseminated to all FSM State Special Education Coordinators for state-level dissemination, including to their State Advisory Panel members.

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 2011-2012 APR, including recommendations for possible revisions to targets and improvement activities. The following sessions were held:

- **September 18-21, 2012**: The FSM National SPP/APR committee meeting was held in Chuuk to review 2011-2012 performance from each LEA through the development of their 2012-2013 LPP. The four LEA LPP data aggregated at the SEA/National-level served as the basis for the FSM 2011-2012 APR. With technical support from Guam CEDDERS and SDSU Interwork, 25 representatives from the four FSM States, including representatives from the LEA advisory panels, and NDOE Special Education Program reviewed each LEA's LPP for 2012-2013 in preparation for FSM's FFY 2011 SPP/APR submission to OSEP in February 2013.

The committee also spent time assessing the effectiveness of the LEA and SEA improvement activities based on the improvement activities evaluation resources received from the August 2012 IDEA Conference. It was important to be able to reflect on the progress made and how the improvement activities might have influenced the changes. In addition, the committee reviewed the OSEP's FFY 2011 SPP/APR proposed changes and Results Driven Accountability (RDA) focus presented during the 2012 IDEA Conference. This review provided additional information for consideration in FSM's FFY 2011 SPP/APR development.

- **February 5-7, 2013**: With the receipt of OSEP Memorandum 13-6 in December 2012, the FSM National SPP/APR committee convened in Pohnpei to review OSEP's final instructions for the SPP/APR development. With technical support from Guam CEDDERS, 15 representatives from the four FSM States and NDOE Special Education Program reviewed FSM's data and information

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

for inclusion into FSM's FFY 2011 SPP/APR due no later than February 15, 2013. The meeting included a discussion on considerations for reporting consistent with OSEP Memorandum 13-6.

OSEP Memorandum 13-6, December 2012

OSEP Memorandum 13-6 provided additional instructions for the development of the FFY 2011 APR. Within the memorandum, OSEP provided options for consideration in the APR development. FSM is reporting the following options chosen:

- Indicator 2: FSM chooses to use the same data source and measurement used in the FFY 2010 APR. FSM submits the required Indicator 2 data and information in this APR.
- Indicator 20: FSM chooses to wait for OSEP's calculation of FSM's compliance with Indicator 20 requirements. As communicated by OSEP during the December 2012 TA call, states/entities will have an opportunity to respond to OSEP's Indicator 20 calculation during "clarification" period anticipated in April 2013.
- Improvement Activities: FSM chooses to keep the same format of its improvement activities under each indicator as in previous years, instead of creating one set of improvement activities for the APR referenced to each indicator.

With OSEP's additional instructions in Memorandum 13-6, **FSM's Part B FFY 2011 APR includes actual target data and required discussion for 13 of the 20 SPP Indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18, and 19.** The 7 SPP Indicators not in this APR include: Indicator 6, which is being submitted as a SPP; Indicators 9, 10, and 12, which have not been applicable to FSM; Indicators 16 and 17 have been deleted by OSEP effective FFY 2011; and for Indicator 20, the APR includes only the measurement description awaiting OSEP's calculation to provide FSM's response, if needed.

As indicated earlier, FSM will continue to utilize the same Improvement Activity format by individual indicators for this APR submission. Washington State's improvement activity categories were used as the basis for organizing the APR improvement activities. For each improvement activity, the "system category" is identified to ensure consideration has been made for all components of the system critical for effecting improved performance. The system categories include:

- Improving data collection and reporting
- Improving systems administration and monitoring
- Providing training/professional development
- Providing technical assistance
- Clarifying/developing policies and procedures
- Program development
- Collaboration/coordination
- Evaluation
- Increasing/adjusting FTE
- Other

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 includes the performance on the targets in the SPP. For the 2011-2012 APR, NDOE will implement the following public dissemination:

1. By March 15, 2013, upon submission of the FSM IDEA Part B APR to the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs, NDOE Special Education Program will e-mail the APR to each LEA Special Education Coordinator and State Advisory Panel Chairperson for dissemination at the LEA-level to the special education advisory panel members.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

2. By May 15, 2013, 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 2013 clarification week. The NDOE Secretary will distribute a memo to the FSM President and Secretaries of other National Government agencies notifying them of the posting and availability of the full report.
3. By May 15, 2013, 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 Coordinators. 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 websites, and LEA contact information for obtaining a full copy of the report.
4. By May 15, 2013, a summary of the FSM IDEA Part B APR with contact information for obtaining a full copy of the APR will be announced through the LEAs on local radio stations, as appropriate.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

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 adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (2011-2012)	As per OSEP's instruction, required reporting is the state's examination of data for the year before the reporting year (e.g. for the FFY 2011 APR, use data from 2010-2011). Therefore, for Indicator 1, the target and actual data for FFY 2011 will be the FFY 2010 data.
2010 (2010-2011)	81% of youth with IEP's will graduate with a high school diploma.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (2011-2012): As per OSEP's instruction, Actual Target Data will be the actual data from FFY 2010 (2010-2011):

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 for FFY 2010.

FSM's overall National data for FFY 2010 (2010-2011) of **90%** (37/41) exceeded the SPP target of 81%. The Table below lists the 41 seniors with IEPs across the four LEAs; of which 37 out of 41 or 90% graduated with a regular high school diploma.

Actual data by LEAs for FFY 2010 (2010-2011):

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

FSM Breakdown of LEA Percent of Youth with IEPs who Graduated with a Diploma			
LEA	# & % of Youth with IEPs & with a High School Diploma in FSM		
	2010-2011		
	# Seniors	# Graduates*	% Graduated
CHUUK	13	13	100%
KOSRAE	1	1	100%
POHNPEI	23	19	83%
YAP	4	4	100%
TOTAL	41	37	37/41 x 100 = 90%

*Data Source: IDEA 618 Table 4 Data Report for FFY 2010

FSM Special Education verified data reported by each LEA from the FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS), including senior enrollment. Three (3) LEAs reported significant increases in performance from FFY 2009 to FFY 2010 and 1 LEA maintained 100% for these two reporting periods:

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

- Chuuk State reported an increase of 20% from 80% (8/10) graduates in FFY 2009 to 100% (13/13) reported in FFY 2010.
- Kosrae State maintained a performance of 100% for FFY 2009 with 7 out of 7 and for FFY 2010 with 1 out of 1.
- Pohnpei State's performance showed an 11% increase from 72% (21/29) graduates for FFY 2009 to FFY 2010 reported graduates at 83% (19/23).
- Yap State reported 1 of the 2 seniors or 50% graduated with a high school diploma in FFY 2009 and in FFY 2010, all 4 seniors or 100% graduated with a high school diploma.

"Graduation with a high school diploma" is defined in the FSM as the completion of required course credits during high school, with each LEA establishing the required total number of course credits to complete. The following are the graduation requirements for high school credits for each State: Chuuk = 22 credits; Kosrae = 18 credits; Pohnpei = 21 credits; and Yap = 20 credits. These requirements are consistent for students with and without disabilities.

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

As per OSEP's instructions, for this APR, FSM reports FFY 2010 (2010-2011) data and compares it to FSM FFY 2010 (2010-2011) target.

FSM's overall National data for FFY 2010 (2010-2011) of **90%** (37/41) exceeded the SPP target of 81% and represented progress from FFY 2009 performance of 77% (37/48).

OSEP FFY 2010 APR Determination Letter, June 2012

OSEP looks forward to FSM's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.

OSEP Memorandum 13-6, December 2012

OSEP provided additional instructions in an effort to reduce reporting burden. For the FFY 2011 APR, States:

- 1) Are not required to provide an explanation of: a) progress; b) no change in actual target data from the data for FFY 2010; or c) slippage if the State meets its target.
- 2) Are not required to discuss improvement activities for: a) compliance indicators where the State reports 100% compliance for FFY 2011; and b) results indicators where the State has met its FFY 2011 target.
- 3) May provide one set of improvement activities for the entire APR as long as the Improvement Activities are indexed back to reference the relevant indicators.

For Indicator 1, FSM exceeded its target and therefore is not required to provide an explanation of progress or slippage and a discussion on improvement activities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-2013:

FSM did not revise or add improvement activities for Indicator 1, but would like to acknowledge that the improvement activities for Indicators 2, 4, 13, and 14 will greatly support FSM continue to meet its target for Indicator 1, and more importantly, will impact the individualized programming needs for each student with an IEP to stay in school.

FSM will continue to implement the SPP Improvement Activities for Indicator 1, as indicated below:

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Status of Improvement Activities

Improvement Activity 1: System Category: TA / Training / Professional Development
Facilitate training for secondary general education and special education teachers on effective strategies for providing secondary students with disabilities access to the general curriculum.

Status: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012

Improvement Activity 2: System Category: Administration and Monitoring
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 LEA to provide appropriate intervention, as needed.

Status: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012

Improvement Activity 3: System Category: Administration and Monitoring
Continue monitoring the collection of graduation comparison data through the LEA quarterly reports to NDOE and the NDOE on-site monitoring/verification visits, as scheduled during the school year.

Status: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

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))

FFY 2010 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 2011 NEW Measurement: States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator. **Data Source:** Same data as used for reporting to the Department under IDEA section 618.

OSEP APR Instructions, December 2012

OSEP provided additional instructions for Indicator 2. For the FFY 2011 APR, States may report using the data source and measurement included in the Part B Indicator Measurement Table that expires July 31, 2015, or the State may choose to report using the same data source and measurement that the State used for its FFY 2010 APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Based on OSEP's December 2012 additional instructions, **FSM has chosen to utilize the same data source and measurement used in its FFY 2010 APR for its FFY 2011 Indicator 2 reporting.** The following sections therefore are based on the FFY 2010 APR Indicator 2 measurement guidance:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (2011-2012)	As per OSEP's instruction, required reporting is the state examination of data for the year before the reporting year (e.g. for the FFY 2011 APR, use data from 2010-2011). Therefore, for Indicator 2, the target and actual data for FFY 2011 will be the FFY 2010 data.
2010 (2010-2011)	0% of youth with IEPs drop out of high school.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (2011-2012): As per OSEP's instruction, Actual Target Data will be the actual data from FFY 2010 (2010-2011):

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. FSM's drop-out definition is consistent with the definition used for reporting 618 exit data. The total number of youth with IEPs that dropped out is consistent with the 618 reported exit data.

FSM's actual data for FFY 2010 was 3% (13/414). The high school enrollment for 9th - 12th grade was verified through each LEA special education office and education data office. The FSM Breakdown by LEAs as follows:

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

FSM Breakdown of LEA Drop-Out Rates

2010-2011 School Year	# & % of Youth with IEPs who Dropped Out in FSM		
	# 9 th -12 th Graders	# Drop-Outs	% Drop-Outs
CHUUK	35	2	5.7%
KOSRAE	41	7	17%
POHNPEI	286	1	.3%
YAP	52	3	5.8%
TOTAL	414	13	13/414 x 100 = 3%

Actual data by LEAs for FFY 2007 through FFY 2010:

The following tables show comparison data from FFY 2007 through 2010 for each LEA:

CHUUK:

CHUUK State	# & % Drop-Outs in Chuuk											
	2007-2008			2008-2009			2009-2010			2010-2011		
	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop- Outs	%Drop- Outs	#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	114	4	3.5%	53	9	17%	48	3	6%	35	2	5.7%

KOSRAE:

KOSRAE State	# & % Drop-Outs in Kosrae											
	2007-2008			2008-2009			2009-2010			2010-2011		
	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop- Outs	%Drop- Outs	#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	57	5	8.8%	48	6	12.5%	51	6	12%	41	7	17%

POHNPEI:

POHNPEI State	# & % Drop-Outs in Pohnpei											
	2007-2008			2008-2009			2009-2010			2010-2011		
	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop- Outs	%Drop- Outs	#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	179	2	1.1%	183	8	4.4%	219	0	0%	286	1	.3%

YAP:

YAP State	# & % Drop-Outs in Yap											
	2007-2008			2008-2009			2009-2010			2010-2011		
	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop- Outs	%Drop- Outs	#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	33	2	6%	52	3	5.8%	44	0	0%	52	3	5.8%

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

As per OSEP's instructions, for this APR, FSM reports FFY 2010 (2010-2011) data and compares the data to FSM's FFY 2010 (2010-2011) target.

FSM target for FFY 2010 is 0%. FSM's actual data for FFY 2010 was 3% (13/414), which represents slippage from 2.5% (9/362) in FFY 2009. FSM did not meet its target for FFY 2010. However, the total number of youth with IEPs enrolled continued to increase from 336 in FFY 2008 to 362 in FFY 2009 to

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

414 in FFY 2010, an increased difference of 78 enrolled youth with IEPs from FFY 2008. This increase in enrollment shows FSM's efforts to keep youth with IEPs in school.

The FSM LEAs continue to implement an internal review process to 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 elects to complete his/her high school years. In July 2012, training facilitated by San Diego State University was conducted in Yap State on the revised Special Education Procedural Manual. The revised manual contains new Termination Forms with all the exiting categories.

With the first FSM Response to Intervention (Rtl) workshop held in Chuuk State in April 2011 and the FSM Association of Chief State School Officers (FACSSO) endorsement of the Rtl Initiative through Resolution 11-02, FSM continued to develop the Rtl framework at both the National and State levels to ensure deliberate planning would result in effective implementation in the schools and classrooms. In July 2011, a follow-up Rtl workshop was held in Pohnpei. The purpose for this workshop was to continue the development of FSM's Rtl framework, which included the identification of FSM's Transformation Teams at the National and State levels. These teams served as the key drivers for developing a meaningful multi-tiered support system for FSM's schools and classrooms. In October 2011, the Transformation Teams participated in the Rtl Innovation Conference in Salt Lake City, Utah and visited innovative school programs implementing the Rtl framework. The application of the Rtl framework within FSM was then documented through the development of the FSM Rtl guidelines. In July 2012, San Diego State University and the Western Regional Resource Center facilitated a training session for general educators and special educators on the FSM Rtl guidelines in Yap State for all LEAs.

OSEP FFY 2010 APR Determination Letter, June 2012

OSEP looks forward to FSM's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.

Status of Improvement Activities

The following describes progress made on the implementation of improvement activities organized by improvement activity system categories. If needed, the improvement activities were re-ordered to account for the completion of improvement activities noted in the FFY 2010 APR:

Improvement Activity 1: **System Category: Data Collection and Reporting**
Beginning school year 2005-2006, interface SPP drop-out data requirements with EMIS and the special education Student Information Tracking System (SITS) for reporting accurate and timely data for all levels: School, LEA, and National, to include federal reporting for drop-out data (exit data for special education).

'11-'12 Progress: **Continuing Activity through FFY 2012:** NOTE: Merged SPP Improvement Activities 1 and 2. As noted in Indicators 4 and 20, FSM NDOE Basic Education Division is responsible for the development of the overall National DOE student data system. The LEAs continue to submit their data via "hard" copy to the NDOE. Drop-out data are inputted into SITS and verified with each LEA. FSM NDOE Special Education Program continues to work with NDOE's overall student data system, but in the meantime, FSM has been able to ensure timely and accurate data for students with IEPs through the "hard" copy data input into the SITS, with verification with each LEA prior to FSM's submission of the required IDEA 618 Table 4 exit data.

Improvement Activity 2: **System Category: Administration and Monitoring:** Continue monitoring the collection of drop-out comparison data through the FSM State quarterly reports to NDOE and the NDOE on-site monitoring/verification visits, as scheduled during the school year.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

'11-'12 Progress: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012: FSM NDOE continues to review each LEA's quarterly reports and verifies data submitted during the scheduled on-site monitoring visits. In addition, through the annual LEA Local Performance Plan (LPP) development, Indicator 2 data are reviewed for accuracy and issues related to procedural and special education service implementation.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-2013:

FSM indicated the status of the improvement activities within the Discussion Section and added Improvement Activity #3 for Indicator 2, as described below. In addition, FSM would like to acknowledge that the improvement activities for Indicators 1, 4, 13, and 14 will greatly support FSM meet its target for Indicator 2, and more importantly, will impact the individualized programming needs for each student with an IEP to stay in school.

Improvement Activity 3: System Category: TA/Training/Professional Development: Develop and Implement a FSM National Response to Intervention (RtI) Initiative to support the curriculum, instruction, and assessment framework for all students, including students with IEPs.

New Activity: Justification: To address the education system needs for strengthening the core instruction and system supports for students with IEPs to stay in school.

Timeline: Through FFY 2012.

Responsible Person/s: NDOE Basic Education and Accreditation and Special Services Divisions, and State Departments of Education.

Resources: Collaboration between National and State general education and special education programs, with technical support from technical providers, such as the Western Regional Resource Center (WRRC), San Diego State University (SDSU), and RtI consultants.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

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/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.**
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate academic achievement standards.**

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

Measurement:

- A. 3A (choose either 3A.1 or 3A.2)
 - A.1 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.
3A.1 Data Source: AYP data used for accountability reporting under Title I of the ESEA.
 - A.2 AMO percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AMO 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.
3A.2 Data Source: AMO data used for accountability reporting under Title I of the ESEA as a result of ESEA flexibility.
- 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.
Data Source: ED*Facts* file specification N/X081.
- C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.
Data Source: ED*Facts* file specifications N/X075 and N/X078.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (2011-2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Not Applicable to FSM. B. 100% participation rate of children with IEPs. C. 5% 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 2011 (2011-2012):

The FSM National Department of Education (NDOE) administers the FSM National Minimum Competency Test (NMCT) for Math and Reading. It is anticipated that the new Science instrument will be developed and piloted in Spring 2013 and administered in school year 2013-2014.

The Spring 2012 Math NMCT was administered to all students with and without disabilities in grades 4, 6, 8, and 10 in all LEAs, with exception of Chuuk State. Chuuk Department of Education did not administer

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

the test to all 4th graders due to the insufficient number of testing materials. In addition, the NMCT results for all public high schools in Pohnpei State were not submitted to NDOE in time for the compilation of the assessment data for all students. In Fall 2012, all LEAs received a new Optical Machine Reader (OMR) so that test scanning and scoring can be done at the state-level. On December 17-20, 2012, NDOE facilitated training for the new OMR with LEA Data and Assessment Specialists and other support staff, including the Special Education Data and Assessment Specialists. This will help ensure that all assessment data will be collected, compiled, and analyzed in a timely manner.

The Spring 2012 Reading NMCT 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 for Reading and Math in the tested grades.

Measurement A: Does not apply to the FSM.

Measurement B: Participation Rate: Based on IDEA 618 Reported Data for students with IEPs enrolled in a full academic year and not full academic year.

618 Table 6: Statewide Math Assessment for SY 2011-2012 – Participation

2011-2012 National Minimum Competency Test (NMCT)		3B. PARTICIPATION: MATH Assessment					
		Grade 4	Grade 6	Grade 8	Grade 10	TOTAL	
						#	%
a.	Children with IEPs	99	194	166	25	484	
b.	Regular assess with NO accommodations	10	43	35	6	94	19%
c.	Regular assess with accommodations	34	85	75	7	201	42%
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	1	3	1	0	5	1%
Overall: [(b+c+d+e+f) divided by a]		46%	68%	67%	52%	300	62%
Children with IEPs included in "a" but not included in the other subcategories:							
Absent		54	63	55	12	184	38%

618 Table 6: Statewide Reading Assessment for SY 2011-2012 – Participation

2011-2012 National Minimum Competency Test (NMCT)		3B. PARTICIPATION: READING Assessment				
		Grade 6	Grade 8	Grade 10	TOTAL	
					#	%
a.	Children with IEPs	194	166	25	385	
b.	Regular assess with NO accommodations	36	35	7	78	20%
c.	Regular assess with accommodations	80	58	7	145	38%
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	3	1	0	4	1%
Overall: [(b+c+d+e+f) divided by a]		61%	57%	56%	227	59%
Children with IEPs included in "a" but not included in the other subcategories:						
Absent		75	72	11	158	41%

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Measurement C: Proficiency Rates: Based on 618 reported data for students with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned. These include valid scores for students with IEPs who were enrolled in a full academic year and not full academic year.

618 Table 6: Statewide Math Assessment for SY 2011-2012 – Proficiency

2011-2012 National Minimum Competency Test (NMCT)		3C. PROFICIENCY: MATH Assessment					
		Grade 4	Grade 6	Grade 8	Grade 10	TOTAL	
						#	%
a.	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned (Full and Not Full Academic Year)	45	131	111	13	300	
b.	Proficient or above in regular assess with NO accommodations	0	0	0	0	0	0%
c.	Proficient or above in regular assess with accommodations	1	0	0	0	1	.3%
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	0	2	0	0	2	.7%
Overall: [(b+c+d+e+f) divided by a]		2%	1.52%	0	0	3	1%

618 Table 6: Statewide Reading Assessment for SY 2011-2012 – Proficiency

2011-2012 National Minimum Competency Test (NMCT)		3C. PROFICIENCY: READING Assessment				
		Grade 6	Grade 8	Grade 10	TOTAL	
					#	%
a.	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned (Full and Not Full Academic Year)	119	94	14	227	
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	2	0	2	.9%
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	2	0	0	2	.9%
Overall: [(b+c+d+e+f) divided by a]		1.7%	1.7%	0%	4	1.8%

Public Reporting Requirement for Assessment Data. FSM NDOE has begun to publicly report annual assessment data for all students through the *FSM National Minimum Competency Standard-Based Test (NMCT) Annual Report*. In September 2012, NDOE launched its new website to include posting of the annual assessment reports. The NDOE posted the SY2010-2011 and SY2011-2012 FSM NMCT Reports on the upgraded NDOE website at <http://www.fsmed.fm>. It should be noted that 2012 marked the first year that the annual reports were posted on the NDOE website.

The *NMCT SY2011-2012 Annual Report*, dated September 3, 2012, displayed the disaggregated data for participation of students with IEPs. FSM also posts the participation and performance data of students with disabilities through its APR and 618 data submission on the NDOE websites: <http://www.fsmed.fm> and <http://www.fsmsped.org/dashboard>.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

It should be noted that the numbers in the *NMCT SY2011-2012 Annual Report* do not correspond with the data reported in the 618 data submission. The NMCT report did not account for the manual verification of results conducted by NDOE, which revealed that some students with IEPs were counted under general education because of a coding error during the administration of the assessment. The 618 data reported in this indicator therefore represent accurate and verified data for the participation and performance of students with IEPs in the tested grades.

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

FSM did not meet its FFY 2011 participation target of 100%. FSM's actual participation data showed slippage in both Math and Reading from previous year's reporting. For Math, FSM's performance went from 71% (235/330) in FFY 2010 to 62% (300/484) in FFY 2011. For Reading, FSM's performance was at 89% (313/350) in FFY 2010, then **59%** (227/385) in FFY 2011.

FSM did not meet its FFY 2011 proficiency target and demonstrated slippage for both Math and Reading. The proficiency performance for Math decreased from 2% in FFY 2010 to 1% in FFY 2011, and for Reading, the decrease was from 3.4% in FFY 2010 to 1.8% in FFY 2011.

In FFY 2011, Pohnpei and Kosrae States administered the assessment to all schools. However, miscommunication and scheduling were issues that FSM continues to address to ensure that all students, including students with disabilities in the tested grades, participate in the assessment. The major challenge for ensuring that every student participates in the assessment has been the geographic locations of 54 schools on different remote islands that can only be accessed by ship. NDOE, through the request from all LEAs, will therefore begin to administer the NMCT in all remote islands in FFY 2012.

To increase proficiency rates for students with IEPs, NDOE has engaged in several initiatives that focus on direct supports to the schools and classrooms for improving teaching and learning to positively impact assessment results. Over the years, NDOE has facilitated planning sessions between general education and special education leaders to discuss the need to improve instructional supports as a system. Reflected in Indicators 5 and 6, FSM's Least Restrictive Environments (LRE) data have shown that the majority of students with IEPs in the FSM are in the general education classroom for most of the school day. The collaborative partnership between general education and special education is therefore imperative to ensure students with IEPs have access to the general curriculum with the needed instructional supports for improving assessment results.

The FSM Response to Intervention (Rtl) Initiative and the Pacific Assessment Consortium (PAC6) are just two examples of FSM's Initiatives that prioritize strengthening the academic instructional supports for all students. In addition, LEA-specific training activities have targeted increasing personnel knowledge and skills on how to support students with IEPs access the general curriculum.

In FFY 2010, a FSM Rtl workshop held in Chuuk State led to the endorsement of the Rtl Initiative by all LEA Directors of Education during the FSM Association of Chief State School Officers (FACSSO) meeting. In FFY 2011, the FSM Rtl Initiative continued the partnership between general education and special education with specific plans for implementation. In July 2011, a follow-up Rtl workshop was held in Pohnpei. The purpose for this workshop was to continue the development of FSM's Rtl framework, which included the identification of FSM's Transformation Teams at the National and State levels. These teams served as the key drivers for developing a meaningful multi-tiered support system for FSM's schools and classrooms. In October 2011, the Transformation Teams participated in the Rtl Innovation Conference in Salt Lake City, Utah and visited innovative school programs implementing the Rtl framework. The application of the Rtl framework within FSM was then documented in the FSM Rtl guidelines. In July 2012, San Diego State University and the Western Regional Resource Center facilitated a training session for general educators and special educators on the FSM Rtl guidelines in Yap State for all LEAs.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

The PAC6 continues to be a resource support for FSM's commitment to improving the participation and performance of all students in the nation-wide assessment, including FSM's AA-AAS. Improvement efforts have focused on supporting the LEAs with improving curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Regional events and on-site training and technical assistance visits have provided direct support to school administrators, general education teachers, special education teachers, parents, and students with IEPs. The development of local technical supports has assisted FSM with increasing its capacity for providing assistance to teachers in the classrooms.

The PAC6 is one of the state partners in the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) Project. The NCSC Project priority is on the development of an AA-AAS aligned to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). The NCSC AA-AAS development is also paired with developing support materials, resources, and personnel capacity for improving academic instruction. This partnership has provided support for incorporating "college and career ready" standards into the FSM curriculum, instruction, and assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities requiring an AA-AAS.

On March 27-28 2012, NDOE participated in the NCSC Full Project Meeting in Las Vegas, NV, to contribute to the cross work group efforts that included substantive presentations on current project issues and opportunities, as well as cross state discussions on CCSS transition needs and planning. NDOE also participated in the NCSC-PAC6 meetings on March 26 and 29, 2012, which provided each PAC6 entity with an overview of the NCSC Project and a review of the Learner Characteristics Inventory (LCI) data of their students with significant cognitive disabilities.

OSEP FFY 2010 APR Determination Letter, June 2012

OSEP looks forward to FSM's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.

Status of Improvement Activities

The following describes progress made on the implementation of improvement activities organized by improvement activity system categories. If needed, the improvement activities were re-ordered to account for the completion of improvement activities noted in the FFY 2010 APR:

Improvement Activity 1:

System Category: Policies and Procedures

Full implementation of the special education procedures for determining "participation" in the state-wide assessment system, including an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (AA-AAS).

'11-'12 Progress:

Continuing Activity through FFY 2012. For FFY 2011, in addition to names in the tested grades being provided to the State Assessment Specialists, all LEA Special Education Programs had staff represented in the State Assessment Teams to administer the NMCT to all students with and without disabilities in every school.

NDOE continues to facilitate the completion of the LCI for each student identified to participate in the AA-AAS and ensures each LEA conducts student observations using the National Alternate Assessment Center (NAAC)-PAC6 Student/Program Observation Tools as a means for improving instruction. Guam CEDDERS and NCSC have committed to assisting NDOE with collecting, compiling, and analyzing the LCI data for improving the identification of students with IEPs requiring an AA-AAS and supports needed for academic instruction.

On June 10-13, 2012, State Assessment Teams from all four FSM LEAs participated in the PAC6 regional workshop which focused on the identification of appropriate communication supports and facilitation of access to the general curriculum through integrated environments for improving literacy outcomes.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Improvement Activity 2: System Category: TA/Training/Professional Development
Implementation of the jurisdiction specific FSM plan for re-designing/enhancing FSM's state-wide assessment system, including the determination and implementation of appropriate accommodations for the general assessment, the development of an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards, and the facilitation of on-site training for administrators, teachers, and parents in each FSM State LEA.

'11-'12 Progress: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012. During the week of July 14-16, 2011, representatives from NDOE and the 4 LEAs participated in the PACIFIC Project regional training facilitated by Guam CEDDERS and the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) Project. The training focused on the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and examined the implications of incorporating "college and career ready" standards into the FSM curriculum, instruction, and assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities requiring an AA-AAS.

On-site technical assistance visits were also conducted throughout the year. Guam CEDDERS and NDOE staff conducted on-site visits to Chuuk State on November 14-17, 2011 and Kosrae State during the week of February 6-10 2012. These visits included training for special education teachers and selected general education teachers to provide them with targeted skills, instructional design and strategies to support them in their efforts to meet the needs of their students who are participating in an AA-AAS. Technical assistance included follow-up visits to schools and homes to observe the targeted students and provide recommendations and strategies to their teachers and Related Service Assistants (RSAs) for ensuring progress in the academic instruction.

NDOE and LEA representatives participated in the follow-up PACIFIC Project Cadre training on Guam, February 29 to March 2, 2012. This training was facilitated by Guam CEDDERS and NCSC for Cadre 2 and Cadre 3 members to further their roles as local technical support. Cadre 2 focused on the implementation the NAAC-PAC6 Student/Program Observation Tools for providing direct support to teachers in implementing effective practices for improving academic instruction. Cadre 3 focused on developing local media/video clips of targeted students for training and dissemination. The overall outcome of the 3-day training was to increase local Cadre capacity for addressing how "college and career ready" standards will be incorporated into the curriculum, instruction, and assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities requiring an AA-AAS.

In April 2012, NDOE Special Education Program coordinated an assessment/evaluation workshop in Yap State for all LEA Special Education Assessment Specialists. The workshop was facilitated by Guam CEDDERS.

As discussed earlier, NDOE is developing a new Science assessment instrument that will be piloted in Spring 2013. In collaboration with the Pacific Resources for Education and Learning (PREL), NDOE has completed the second Science item writing phase ready for piloting in the LEAs. The development of the new Science assessment has included representatives from the Special Education Program to ensure assessment accommodations are considered at each phase of the development. Progress on the new Science assessment development can be viewed on <http://www.fsmed.fm>.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Improvement Activity 3: System Category: Data Collection and Reporting
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.

'11-'12 Progress: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012. To ensure every answer sheet is accounted for, beginning FFY 2012, each LEA will have its own Optical Machine Reader (OMR). In addition, NDOE will be revising its answer sheet to make it simpler to identify students with disabilities and their accommodations, if any.

FSM continues to store and track assessment data for students with disabilities by verifying the results from the testing specialists prior to inputting the data into the FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS).

Improvement Activity 4: System Category: Administration and Monitoring
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 NDOE and the NDOE on-site monitoring/verification visits, as scheduled during the school year.

'11-'12 Progress: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012. Refer to progress noted for Improvement Activities 1 & 2. Further, on-site LEA technical support provided by NDOE and the 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 2012-2013:

FSM will not change the targets at this time and will continue to implement the Improvement Activities described in the "Status of Improvement Activities" within the Discussion section. FSM added Improvement Activity #5 to provide focused support for the FSM Rtl Initiative. This activity is also identified in Indicator 2 to address the system supports for students with IEPs to stay in school.

Improvement Activity 5: System Category: TA/Training/Professional Development: Develop and Implement a FSM National Response to Intervention (Rtl) Initiative to support the curriculum, instruction, and assessment framework for all students, including students with IEPs.

New Activity: Justification: To address the education system needs for strengthening the core instruction and system supports for students with IEPs to stay in school.

Timeline: Through FFY 2012.

Responsible Person/s: NDOE Basic Education and Accreditation and Special Services Divisions, and State Departments of Education.

Resources: Collaboration between National and State general education and special education programs, with technical support from technical providers, such as the Western Regional Resource Center (WRRC), San Diego State University (SDSU), and Rtl consultants.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

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 for 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	Measureable and Rigorous Target
2011 (2011-2012)	As per OSEP's instruction, required reporting is the state's examination of data for the year before the reporting year (e.g. for the FFY 2011 APR, use data from 2010-2011). Therefore, for Indicator 4, the target and actual data for FFY 2011 will be the FFY 2010 data.
2010 (2010-2011)	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 2011 (2011-2012): As per OSEP's instruction, Actual Target Data will be the actual data from FFY 2010 (2010-2011):

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

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, if needed, FSM's "significant discrepancy" definition. This annual review will be conducted because FSM has been reporting in previous years "0" suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for students with disabilities.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

The following tables display the long-term suspension/expulsion data by LEAs, as reported in FSM's IDEA 618 Table 5 for FFY 2005 through FFY 2010. As shown, for FFY 2010, all LEAs reported "0" long-term suspension/expulsion.

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%
December 1, 2008	551	0	0	0	0	0	0%
December 1, 2009	607	0	0	0	0	0	0%
December 1, 2010	756	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%
December 1, 2008	183	0	0	0	0	0	0%
December 1, 2009	188	0	0	0	0	0	0%
December 1, 2010	201	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%
December 1, 2008	666	0	0	0	0	0	0%
December 1, 2009	728	0	0	0	0	0	0%
December 1, 2010	686	0	0	0	0	0	0%

*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%
December 1, 2008	144	0	0	2	1.4%	2	1.4%
December 1, 2009	157	0	0	3	1.9%	3	1.9%
December 1, 2010	187	0	0	0	0	0	0%

*Child Count Total for Ages 3-21

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Measurement B: Does not apply to the FSM.

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

As per OSEP's instructions, for this APR, FSM reports FFY 2010 (2010-2011) data and compares it to FSM FFY 2010 (2010-2011) target.

FSM met its target of 0% significant discrepancy between LEAs, maintaining the same performance as the previous year.

OSEP FFY 2010 APR Determination Letter, June 2012

OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.

OSEP Memorandum 13-6, December 2012

OSEP provided additional instructions in an effort to reduce reporting burden. For the FFY 2011 APR, States:

- 4) Are not required to provide an explanation of: a) progress; b) no change in actual target data from the data for FFY 2010; or c) slippage if the State meets its target.
- 5) Are not required to discuss improvement activities for: a) compliance indicators where the State reports 100% compliance for FFY 2011; and b) results indicators where the State has met its FFY 2011 target.
- 6) May provide one set of improvement activities for the entire APR as long as the Improvement Activities are indexed back to reference the relevant indicators.

For Indicator 4, FSM met its target and therefore is not required to provide an explanation of progress or slippage and a discussion on improvement activities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-2013:

FSM will continue to implement the SPP Improvement Activities for Indicator 4, as indicated below:

Status of Improvement Activities

<u>Improvement Activity 1:</u>	<u>System Category: Data Collection and Reporting</u> 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.
--------------------------------	---

Status:	Continuing Activity through FFY 2012
---------	--------------------------------------

<u>Improvement Activity 2:</u>	<u>System Category: Administration and Monitoring</u> 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.
--------------------------------	--

Status:	Continuing Activity through FFY 2012
---------	--------------------------------------

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

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 served 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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (2011-2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. 97.1% of children ages 6-21 with IEPs were served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day B. .25% of children ages 6-21 with IEPs were served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day C. 1% of children ages 6-21 with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

FSM TREND DATA through FFY 2011: OSEP 618 LRE Environments Data, Table 3

Reporting Period	FSM Total # with IEPs	Ages 6 through 21					
		Measurement A Inside Regular Class 80% or more of the day		Measurement B Inside Regular Class less than 40% of the day		Measurement C Separate Schools, Residential, Homebound, Hospital Placements	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2007	1513	1277	84%	105	7%	102	7%
December 1, 2008	1407	1175	84%	89	6%	111	8%
December 1, 2009	1564	1421	91%	44	3%	95	6%
December 1, 2010	1719	1633	95%	29	2%	56	3%
December 1, 2011	1901	1779	94%	48	2.5%	68	3.6%

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

OSEP 618 LRE Environments Data by FSM LEAs for FFYs 2007-2011:

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

Reporting Period	CHUUK Total # with IEPs	Ages 6 through 21					
		Measurement A Inside Regular Class 80% or more of the day		Measurement B Inside Regular Class less than 40% of the day		Measurement C Separate Schools, Residential, Homebound, Hospital Placements	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2007	536	482	90%	0	0	54	10%
December 1, 2008	486	436	90%	0	0	50	10%
December 1, 2009	544	525	97%	0	0	19	3%
December 1, 2010	699	691	99%	0	0	8	1%
December 1, 2011	866	850	98%	1	.1%	11	1%

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

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

Reporting Period	KOSRAE Total # with IEPs	Ages 6 through 21					
		Measurement A Inside Regular Class 80% or more of the day		Measurement B Inside Regular Class less than 40% of the day		Measurement C Separate Schools, Residential, Homebound, Hospital Placements	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2007	164	144	88%	0	0	20	12%
December 1, 2008	144	120	83%	0	0	24	17%
December 1, 2009	167	145	87%	0	0	22	13%
December 1, 2010	163	143	88%	0	0	20	12%
December 1, 2011	156	123	79%	14	9%	17	11%

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

Reporting Period	POHNPEI Total # with IEPs	Ages 6 through 21					
		Measurement A Inside Regular Class 80% or more of the day		Measurement B Inside Regular Class less than 40% of the day		Measurement C Separate Schools, Residential, Homebound, Hospital Placements	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2007	697	554	79%	105	15%	9	1%
December 1, 2008	638	503	79%	89	14%	21	3%
December 1, 2009	703	622	88%	44	6%	37	5%
December 1, 2010	676	630	93%	29	4%	17	3%
December 1, 2011	680	635	93%	32	5%	13	2%

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

Reporting Period	YAP Total # with IEPs	Ages 6 through 21					
		Measurement A Inside Regular Class 80% or more of the day		Measurement B Inside Regular Class less than 40% of the day		Measurement C Separate Schools, Residential, Homebound, Hospital Placements	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2007	116	97	84%	0	0	19	16%
December 1, 2008	139	116	83%	0	0	16	12%
December 1, 2009	150	129	86%	0	0	17	11%
December 1, 2010	181	169	93%	0	0	11	6%
December 1, 2011	199	171	86%	1	.5%	27	14%

Data Source: LRE data used for this indicator were taken from the 618 Table 3 Environments Data.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

Measurement A: FSM did not meet its target of 97.1% and reported a slight slippage from 95% (1633/1719) in FFY 2010 to 94% (1779/1901) in FFY 2011.

Measurement B: FSM did not meet its target of .25% and reported a slight slippage from 2% (29/1719) in FFY 2010 to 2.5% (48/1901) in FFY 2011.

Measurement C: FSM did not meet its target of 1%, and reported a slight slippage from 3% (56/1719) in FFY 2010 to 3.6% (68/1901) in FFY 2011.

Although FSM did not meet its targets for all 3 LRE measurements, FSM continues to demonstrate a significantly higher percentage of students with IEPs served inside the regular classroom for 80% or more of the day with 94% in FFY 2011 compared to the U.S. National mean of 63%, as reported in the FFY 2010 Part B SPP/APR Indicator Analyses completed by NIUSI-Leadscape. Further, of the reported FFY 2010 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 31%, a significantly lower percentage than FSM's 94% performance for FFY 2011.

FSM's high LRE performance shown for Indicator 5 can be attributed to FSM's efforts to increase personnel knowledge and skills for how to include students with IEPs in the least restrictive environment. In addition, there has been better collaboration between general and special education. To encourage this working relationship, FSM continued to build a system of support by conducting trainings for both general and special education, such as RtI workshops; providing resources on Division of Special Services website at <http://www.fsmsped.org/dashboard>; and establishing LEA-level Monitoring Teams that include staff from both general and special education.

FSM continues to participate in various OSEP-funded regional project activities to increase personnel knowledge and skills to provide support for students with IEPs to have access to the general curriculum. Specifically, the University of Guam CEDDERS' PACIFIC Project and Pacific Vision Instruction Project (Pacific VIP) continue to provide opportunities for FSM to engage in regional training events and on-site technical support for administrators, specialists, teachers, families, and children with IEPs. In addition, technical assistance from San Diego State University and the Western Regional Resource Center have provided supports for improving the curriculum, instruction, and assessment system through the development and implementation of a FSM Response to Intervention (RtI) framework.

OSEP FFY 2010 APR Determination Letter, June 2012

OSEP looks forward to FSM's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.

Status of Improvement Activities

The following describes progress made on the implementation of improvement activities organized by improvement activity system categories. If needed, the improvement activities were re-ordered to account for the completion of improvement activities noted in the FFY 2010 APR:

Improvement Activity 1: **System Category: Data Collection and Reporting**
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.

'11-'12 Progress: **Continuing Activity through FFY 2012.** In FFY 2011, the SITS validation report, which contains the summary information of each individual student's record, has been used for LEA weekly case review meetings as a way to

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

plan for IEP meetings and update student records. In addition, SITS displays the summary of total records needing annual reviews or reevaluations and LRE determinations for each LEA. As a result, FSM NDOE is able to better monitor the accuracy of the data.

Improvement Activity 2:

System Category: TA/Training/Professional Development

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

'11-'12 Progress:

Continuing Activity through FFY 2012. In FFY 2011, the procedures and forms for documentation were updated with training modules to provide additional guidance for understanding the requirements.

In July 2012, training facilitated by San Diego State University was conducted in Yap State on the revised Special Education Procedural Manual. The revised manual included training modules for the special education process, including the individual student determination for LRE.

As discussed in Indicator 3, the FSM Response to Intervention (Rtl) Initiative and the Pacific Assessment Consortium (PAC6) were two examples of FSM's Initiatives that prioritize strengthening the academic instructional supports for all students. In addition, LEA-specific training activities have targeted increasing personnel knowledge and skills on how to support students with IEPs access the general curriculum in the LRE. (refer to Indicator 3 for further descriptions of training and technical assistance activities that have focused on instructional supports)

Improvement Activity 3:

System Category: Administration and Monitoring

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.

'11-'12 Progress:

Continuing Activity through FFY 2012. 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 Table 3. Each LEA also implements 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 2012-2013:

FSM will not change the targets at this time and will continue to implement the Improvement Activities described in the "Status of Improvement Activities" within the Discussion section.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

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 or exited 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.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

Table 1: 2011-2012 Target and Performance for Part B Indicator 7

Measurable and Rigorous Target and Performance		
SUMMARY STATEMENTS		
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships).	FFY 2011 Target (% of children)	FFY 2011 Actual (% of children)
Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered or existed the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased in their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	79.7%	$\frac{(c+d)}{(a+b+c+d)} \times 100 = \%$ $\frac{(28+80)}{(2+13+28+80)} \times 100 = 88\%$

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Measurable and Rigorous Target and Performance		
SUMMARY STATEMENTS		
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships).	FFY 2011 Target (% of children)	FFY 2011 Actual (% of children)
Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A, by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	66%	$\frac{(d+e)}{(a+b+c+d+e)} \times 100 = \%$ $\frac{(80+3)}{(2+13+28+80+3)} \times 100 = \%$ $83/126 \times 100 = \%$ 66%
Outcome B: Acquisition & use of knowledge & skills (including early language/communication and early literacy).	FFY 2011 Target (% of children)	FFY 2011 Actual (% of children)
Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased in their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	80.1%	$\frac{(c+d)}{(a+b+c+d)} \times 100 = \%$ $\frac{(34+74)}{(3+11+34+74)} \times 100 = \%$ $108/122 \times 100 = \%$ 89%
Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B, by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	66%	$\frac{(d+e)}{(a+b+c+d+e)} \times 100 = \%$ $\frac{(74+4)}{(3+11+34+74+4)} \times 100 = \%$ $78/126 \times 100 = \%$ 62%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	FFY 2011 Target (% of children)	FFY 2011 Actual (% of children)
Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased in their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	88%	$\frac{(c+d)}{(a+b+c+d)} \times 100 = \%$ $\frac{(32+77)}{(2+10+32+77)} \times 100 = \%$ $109/121 \times 100 = \%$ 90%
Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C, by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	68.4%	$\frac{(d+e)}{(a+b+c+d+e)} \times 100 = \%$ $\frac{(77+5)}{(2+10+32+77+5)} \times 100 = \%$ $82/126 \times 100 = \%$ 65%

For this reporting period, there were 126 preschoolers with IEPs that had both entry and exit measures. Of the **126** preschoolers, there were 70 from Chuuk, 25 from Kosrae, 22 from Pohnpei, and 9 from Yap State.

As indicated in the table above, FSM met four (4) of the six outcome targets:

- **Outcome A: Positive Social Emotional Skills**
 - For Summary Statement (SS) 1, FSM reported **88%** of preschool children who exited the preschool program below age expectations in social emotional skills substantially increased in their rate of growth of social emotional skills. For this Outcome A measurement, FSMs performance was at 88% exceeding the target of **79.7%** for this reporting period.
 - For Summary Statement 2, **66%** of preschoolers were functioning within age expectations in social emotional skills, by the time they exited. FSM met its target of 66% for this outcome measure with a performance of **66%**.

- **Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy,**
 - For Summary Statement 1, FSM reported **89%** of preschool children exited the preschool program below expectations in acquiring and using knowledge and skills substantially increased in their rate of growth of acquiring and using knowledge and skills. FSM's performance of 89% exceeded the target of **80.1%** for this reporting period.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

- For Summary Statement 2, **62%** of preschoolers were functioning within age expectations in acquiring and using knowledge and skills, by the time they exited. FSM did not meet the target of **66%** for this outcome measure with a performance of 62% for this reporting period. This is a slippage from 76.4% in FFY 2010 to 62% for FFY2011. The reason for the decrease in the performance for this Outcome measure is due to the higher number of preschoolers in measurement categories b and c (meaning there were more preschoolers with disabilities that require additional supports).
- **Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:**
 - For Summary Statement 1, FSM reported **90%** of preschool children who exited the preschool program below expectations in using appropriate behaviors to meet their needs substantially increased in their rate of growth. FSM's performance of 90% exceeded the target of **88%** for this reporting period.
 - For Summary Statement 2, **65%** of preschoolers were functioning within age expectations in the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs, by the time they exited. FSM did not meet the target of **68.4%** for this reporting period. This is a slippage from what was reported in FFY 2010 at 83.3%. This may be due to an increase of the percent of preschoolers in measurement categories b and c (33%) for this reporting period in comparison to what was reported in FFY 2010 at 17% indicating a higher number of preschoolers with disabilities requiring additional supports.

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

FSM exceeded the target of 79.7% for Outcome A, Summary Statement 1 for this reporting period. FSMs actual performance was at 88% (108/123). For Outcome A, Summary Statement 2, FSM met its target of 66% with the actual performance data at 66% (83/126). For Outcome B, Summary Statement 1, FSM exceeded the target for FFY 2011 at 80.1% with a performance data at 89% (108/122). For Outcome B, Summary Statement 2, FSM did not meet its target of 66% with a slippage at 62% (78/126). For Outcome C, Summary Statement 1, FSM met its target of 88% with a performance at 90% (109/121). For Outcome C, Summary Statement 2, FSM did not meet its target of 68.4% with a performance data of 65% (82/126).

The FSM continues to use the Early Childhood Child Outcome Summary (COS) to report on a child's progress in the three outcome requirements. A child who rates 6 or 7 is considered to be developing at age "comparable to age peers." The child's IEP Team, including the parent, RSAs, and teachers completes the COS. The FSM uses multiple sources of information to assist the IEP Team in completing the COS, such as the FSM Inventory of development (FSM-ID), parent interview, medical reports, evaluation reports and teacher observations. The Special Education Coordinator from each LEA with assistance of the FSM SEA Special Education Office monitors the implementation of the Early Childhood Outcome Measurement System guidelines to ensure the data is accurate, includes all children who meet the criteria for the measurements, and are conducted within specified timelines. FSM continues to refine the process for gathering information from teachers, RSAs, and parents. FSM will continue to use the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) format to calculate the OSEP reporting requirements and will make changes to the database as necessary. The LEA Special Education Coordinators and SEA Special Education Program will continue to monitor the implementation of the ECO procedures and data collection protocols to ensure fidelity and validity of the data to be used to support program improvement for improving results for preschoolers with disabilities.

For this reporting period, **126** preschoolers with IEPs exited the program, **an increase** in the number reported in FFY 2010 of 72 preschoolers.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Table 2 provides progress data by LEAs of the number of children and percentages for the five measures for Outcomes A, B, and C. The information on this table was used to determine the performance for each outcome measure listed in Table 1.

Table 2: Progress Data and Percent of Children in the Five Measurement Categories

	Chuuk		Kosrae		Pohnpei		Yap		FSM	
	# Children	% Children	# Children	% Children	# Children	% Children	# Children	% Children	# Children	% Children
A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):										
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	2	22.2%	2	1.6%
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1	1.4%	2	8.0%	8	36.4%	2	22.2%	13	10.3%
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	7	10.0%	13	52.0%	7	31.8%	1	11.1%	28	22.2%
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	62	88.6%	10	40.0%	7	31.8%	1	11.1%	80	63.5%
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	33.3%	3	2.4%
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):										
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	3	33.3%	3	2.4%
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2	2.9%	0	0%	9	40.9%	0	0%	11	8.7%
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	8	11.4%	15	60.0%	9	40.9%	2	22.2%	34	27.0%
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	60	86.7%	10	40.0%	3	13.6%	1	11.1%	74	58.7%
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0%	0	0%	1	4.5%	3	33.3%	4	3.2%

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:										
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	2	22.2%	2	1.9%
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1	1.4%	0	0%	9	40.9%	0	0%	10	7.9%
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	8	11.4%	12	48.0%	9	40.9%	3	33.3%	32	25.4%
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	61	87.1%	13	52.0%	3	13.6%	0	0%	77	61.1%
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0%	0	0%	1	4.5%	4	44.4%	5	4.0%

In comparing the FMS Early Childhood Outcome performance data with the 2010 National Average that was taken from the OSEP Part B SPP/APR 2012 Indicator Analyses, August 2012 booklet, the FSM performed above the national average in the following outcome measures:

- For Outcome A, Summary Statement 1, FSM reported 88% and the national average for 2010 was at 79%
- For Outcome A, Summary Statement 2, FSM performed 66% and the national average was 53%. 13% above the national average
- For Outcome B, Summary Statement 1, FSM data was at 89% significantly higher than the 79% reported for the 2010 national average;
- For Outcome B, Summary Statement 2, FSM reported 62% and national average data was at 53%
- For Outcome C, Summary Statement 1, FSM reported significantly higher at 90% than the national average at 79%.

FSM was slightly lower than the national average for Outcome C, Summary Statement 2 reporting 65% and the national average at 66%. FSM continues to provide training for all early childhood education teachers, Related Service Assistants, early childhood specialists, and parents throughout the four States on strategies to support the overall development of all preschoolers.

OSEP FFY 2010 APR Determination Letter, June 2012

OSEP appreciates FSM's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to FSM's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR. FSM must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.

Status of Improvement Activities

The following describes progress made on the implementation of improvement activities organized by improvement activity system categories. If needed, the improvement activities were re-ordered to account for the completion of improvement activities noted in the FFY 2010 APR:

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Improvement Activity 1: System Category: TA / Training / Professional Development
Annual training with early childhood providers on the implementation of the FSM Early Childhood Outcomes Measurement guidelines is held in each LEA.

'11-'12 Progress: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012. Annual training was conducted at each State on the early childhood outcome measurement guidelines in conjunction with other the Early Childhood Education Programs to ensure continuity and consistency of the implementation of the Early Childhood Outcomes procedures.

In July 2011, Pacific Education Conference (PEC 2011) held in Pohnpei for all Pacific Basin Educators. Training was provided to special education teachers and regular teachers that includes the early childhood outcome measurement system from all over the Pacific Basin.

Improvement Activity 2: System Category: Policy and Procedures
Review and revise the procedures for collecting, reporting, and verifying the data.

'11-'12 Progress: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012. Video conferencing on the early childhood outcomes procedures for collecting, reporting and verifying outcome data was held on September 2011 with technical assistance and support from Guam CEDDERS. Individual LEAs work collaboratively with staff from the Early Childhood Education Program in ensuring completion of the Child Outcomes Summary Form 45 days after the completion of the initial IEP and prior to exiting of the program.

Improvement Activity 3: System Category: TA / Training / Professional Development
Training on strategies on topical areas that would enhance the overall development of young children with disabilities.

'11-'12 Progress: Continuing Activity through 2012. The 2nd FSM Early Hearing Detection and Intervention (EHDI) symposium was held on Yap in August 2011; a collaborative effort between FSM Department of Health, Maternal Child and Health and FSM Special Education.

In addition, the FSM NDOE participated in the 11th Annual National EHDI Conference held on March 2012. A parent of a child with hearing loss attended the meeting with the FSM team. With the help of FSM team, the parent will be presenting in August 2012 at the 3rd FSM EHDI symposium to share her experience at the National EHDI Conference and encourage parents to support early intervention services and bring in their children for screening.

Improvement Activity 4: System Category: TA / Training / Professional Development
In collaboration with Early Childhood Programs, conduct training for parents and teachers on social emotional development of young children using the Center for Social Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CSEFEL). Timeline: 2010-2011.

'11-'12 Progress: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012. In collaboration with the ECE Program, annual ECE trainings are held to include topic such as social emotional development, approaches to learning and other topical areas.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Special education and related service assistance (RSA) providers participate in these trainings.

Improvement Activity 5: System Category: TA / Training / Professional Development
In collaboration with Early Childhood Programs, conduct training for providers and parents on strategies that promote early literacy, language, and communication. Timeline: 2010-2011.

'11-'12 Progress: Chuuk State conducted annual ECE trainings for all regular and special education teachers. Training usually takes 1 week. Topics of discussion involves child outcome framework, overview of assessment tool, reviewing of progressive level trends, reviewing of the 8 domains and indicators, recording of parent/teacher conference (PTC), etc. All teachers are encouraged to attend this annual activity.

In October 2011, Pohnpei State conducted Parent Literacy training throughout the main island recording 519 parents participated.

Improvement Activity 6: System Category: TA/Training/ Professional Development
Provide training for parents and providers on strategies for modifying or adapting the environment, instruction, and the use of assistive technology equipment/materials to enhance the overall development and inclusion of young children with disabilities in school or community settings. Timeline: 2010-2011.

'11-'12 Progress: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012.
In May 28 through June 2, 2012, FSM facilitated an Early Intervention training conducted by Dr. Linda Flynn from University of New Orleans. Fourteen (14) participants from the four FSM states attended representing MCH and special education.

In August 2011, Dr. Ray Miner provided assistance and training on the calibration of hearing equipments such as Tympanometer, Audiometers (MA 25, MA 40). Yap and Pohnpei participated in the training. As a result, Chuuk and Kosrae both received assistance from Pohnpei in the calibration of their hearing screening equipment.

Improvement Activity 7: System Category: Data Collection and Reporting
Develop parent information materials such as posters, brochures, and public service announcements (PSA) based on the Information Fact Sheet that is on the FSM SPED website. Timeline: 2011-2012.

'11-'12 Progress: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012. Results of the early childhood outcomes are reported annually on the FSM special education website including reports on early childhood and related trainings.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines /Resources for 2012-2013:

FSM will not change the targets at this time and will continue to implement the Improvement Activities described in the "Status of Improvement Activities" within the Discussion section.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

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
2011 (2011-2012)	95% of parents report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

For FFY 2011, FSM reports that of the 2049 students with IEPs ages 3-21, **1775 or 87%** of parents responded to the FSM Parent Survey. Table 1 provides the percentage of respondents by each LEA, with the FSM total.

Table 1: FSM Parent Survey Return Rates by State for FFY 2011

State	# Students w/IEPs	# Respondents	% Respondents
Chuuk	945	835	88%
Kosrae	188	178	95%
Pohnpei	708	554	78%
Yap	208	208	100%
Total	2049	1775	(1775/2049) = 87%

FSM's FFY 2011 response rate of 87% (1775/2049) represents an increase of 18% compared to its FFY 2010 response rate of 69% (1255/1830). This increase in respondents is significant given the geographic remoteness of some of the areas within the FSM. As shown in Table 1, all 4 LEAs reported a high percentage of returned surveys, with one of the 4 LEAs returning 100% of the surveys. FSM therefore demonstrates geographic, ethnic, and racial representation in the respondents for its FFY 2011 parent survey.

There are a total of six questions indicated in the "FSM Parent Survey" related to parent involvement in their child's education as a means of improving the services and results for their child with a disability.

The survey items provides three categories for families to respond to - 1) satisfy / understood / included; 2) somewhat; and 3) not enough. The total responses for each survey items, Questions 1 through 6, are calculated based on the total response for each category divided by the number of survey responses. Table 2, shows the breakdown of responses by category for each LEA as well as the aggregated percentage in response to this APR indicator.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Table 2: Percent of Parent Response by Categories for FFY 2011

STATE/LEA	TOTAL # RESPONSES	SATISFY / UNDERSTOOD / INCLUDED	SOMEWHAT	NOT ENOUGH
CHUUK	5010	64% (3190/5010)	32% (1597/5010)	4% (223/5010)
KOSRAE	1068	62% (664/1068)	33% (348/1068)	5.2% (56/1068)
POHNPEI	3324	44% (1452/3324)	34% (1123/3324)	23% (749/3324)
YAP	1248	55% (687/1248)	32% (401/1248)	12.8% (160/1248)
TOTAL	10650	56% 5993/10650	33% 3469/10650	11% 1188/10650

For this indicator, FSM reported a performance of **56%** and did not meet the target set at **95%**, representing slippage of 9% from a performance of 65% in FFY 2010. This slippage in parents reporting schools facilitated parental involvement can be attributed to the significant increase in completed surveys from 69% (1255/1830) in FFY 2010 to 87% (1775/2049) for this reporting year. FSM's efforts to reach out to parents to share their perspectives have resulted in the significant increase in survey return rate. More parents are completing the surveys.

Further analysis of the results by survey items revealed that the majority of parents, representing over 60% of the respondents, reported being satisfied with the special education services and having enough information about their child's special needs and progress in special education. For the survey items related to being a full partner in the decision making process and knowing how to file a complaint, the majority of respondents, representing less than 50%, reported that they did not feel like a full partner and didn't really understand the process for filing a written complaint.

This analysis is viewed as a positive result of FSM's efforts to gather feedback from more parents on how to improve programs and services. The continuous community awareness activities within the LEAs have made parents more aware of their role in their child's services. The drill down of survey item results overall and by LEAs gives FSM targeted areas to focus parent training activities to ensure that parents feel they are full partners in the special education program.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target that occurred for FFY 2011:

FSM did not meet its FFY 2011 target at 95%. FSM's actual data showed 56% (5993/10650) of parents report the schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Based on the 6 item questionnaire a total of 5993 out of 10650 responses indicated their response as "Satisfy / Understood / Included," to the question that their child's school program encouraged active involvement in their child's education. Based on this, FSM did not meet its target of **95%** reporting a **56%** performance rate, which is a slippage from last year's performance of **69%**. However, FSM is reporting that more parents are returning the survey as compared to the last reporting period. For FFY 2010 the total response return rate was **69%** compared to this year's response return rate of **87%** (1775/2049) which is an increase of **18%**.

Two (2) out of the 4 LEAs worked closely with their parent organizations to support the dissemination and completion of the parent surveys. The parent organizations called parents and if needed, met with parents at their home or at the school to provide the parents with assistance in completing the surveys. Parents were given the option of having the survey in their native language or in English or to have the survey read aloud in their vernacular to increase their understanding of the input that is being requested of them by special education staff or an advisory parent member. The other 2 LEAs worked directly with the school principals and teachers in the dissemination and collection of the parent surveys. Last

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

reporting period, Pohnpei State held meetings with the parents in their municipalities however, this year Pohnpei State work closely with the school principals and requested the parents to come to the school to complete the surveys. Having parents come to school increased the return rate from 28% for FFY2010 to 78% for Pohnpei State. The strategies used by each LEA were found successful in the significant high return rate of parent surveys and their commitment to ensure all parents had an opportunity to provide input by completing the surveys.

In September 2011, a joint training was held in collaboration with NDOE and the National Department of Health (NDH) for parents who have children with disabilities on the procedures, where to get assistance for their children, and what services are provided by the Health Services and from Special Education. Training was held in Chuuk State with a total of 54 parents and providers.

In August 11, 2012, NDOE in collaboration with Yap DOE facilitated the “*Parent Consumer Conference*” held in Yap State. Over 400 parents from the FSM States participated with the majority of the parents in attendance from Yap. Kosrae State sent 4 parents to the conference with one of the parents conducting a presentation entitled: “*Mediation and Due Process*”; 6 parents from Chuuk State attended; and 3 parents from Pohnpei State. During the preconference, 2 parents from Chuuk State shared their perspectives on challenges for services especially in the remote islands. The parents also shared the successes they have seen from receiving special education services.

NDOE held Public Hearing on the Special Education Policies and Procedures at each State that included parents and policy makers. The Public Hearing included information on the revised special education manual, private schools policy, and the revised fiscal management procedure. Hearings were held in the month of April 2012: Kosrae State with 35 participants; Pohnpei State with 217 participants in attendance from 3 sites; Chuuk State with 62 participants; and Yap State with 34 participants in attendance.

During the Public Hearing in Pohnpei State, parents were given a copy of the “*Due Process and Mediation Manual*” and Parents Rights. All States annually disseminate the Parent Rights as per the special education procedures. The Parent Rights have been translated into the vernacular languages.

Chuuk State held several parent training throughout this reporting period:

- In July 2011, on Related Services for children with multiple disabilities, 32 parents attended.
- In August 2011, during the Education Symposium, training as provided to parents and teachers on special education and child find procedures. There were 65 participants.

OSEP FFY 2010 APR Determination Letter, June 2012

OSEP looks forward to FSM’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.

Status of Improvement Activities

The following describes progress made on the implementation of improvement activities organized by improvement activity system categories. If needed, the improvement activities were re-ordered to account for the completion of improvement activities noted in the FFY 2010 APR:

Improvement Activity 1: **System Category: Improving Data Collection and Reporting**
A parent focus group, comprised of parent representatives from each LEA, will review and revise, as needed, the FSM Family Survey with translations into the vernacular languages.

‘11-‘12 Progress: **Continuing Activity through FFY 2012:** Each LEAs held focus group meetings to discuss with special education staff and parents that will be assisting in dissemination and collection process of the parent surveys. In addition, the groups reviewed each item to ensure understanding of the items should any parent have a question with the survey items.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

With the revision of the Family Survey, all four LEAs refined the method of disseminating and collecting the information. Pohnpei State and Chuuk State trained special education staff on the survey and either requested the parents to come to the school to complete the survey or the special education staff went to the home to interview the family. Yap State and Kosrae State trained parents in collaboration with the special education staff on the survey.

All LEAs have translated the revised survey into their native languages in addition translators were available to read the survey in their vernacular language for parents who requested for this assistance.

Improvement Activity 2: System Category: Improving Systems Administration and Monitoring
By the end of May each year, the FSM Parent Survey will be disseminated to all parents of students with IEPs.

“11-‘12 Progress: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012. The LEAs continue to disseminate the parent surveys by May of each year. For Pohnpei, Yap, and Chuuk, dissemination of the parent surveys may begin as early as February depending on the schedule of when the FSM ships go to the neighboring islands.

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

“11-‘12 Progress: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012. For this reporting period, the surveys were disseminated through the school principals in Pohnpei and Chuuk and through the parent support groups for the remaining LEAs. In Pohnpei State, the parents were asked to attend a meeting at the school to discuss the purpose of the survey and to complete the survey. Additionally, parents needing assistance most often called their child’s teacher or would ask a family member to translate for them. In addition, the parent surveys were disseminated during the Public Hearings.

Improvement Activity 4: System Category: TA/Training/Professional Development
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.

“11-‘12 Progress: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012. The LEAs identified and trained parent representatives or staff to conduct the parent surveys. In addition, ongoing training was done with parents on the IEP process and forms, parents’ rights, and transition from high school to post-secondary settings and/or employments. At the beginning of each school year, Yap State Special Education Program, in collaboration with the Early Childhood Education (ECE) Program, conducts an orientation for all parents at each ECE center on special education services and supports as one of the public awareness activity. In Chuuk State, the Case Managers and the Coordinator meet with parents to review the special education procedures and Parents Rights on a quarterly basis. All parents with children attending the ECE program in Pohnpei State participate in the “Parent Literacy Week” with

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

numerous events that promote early literacy and parental involvement activities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines /Resources for 2012-2013:

FSM will not change the targets at this time and will continue to implement the Improvement Activities described in the “Status of Improvement Activities” within the Discussion section.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (2011-2012)	100% of children with parental consent received for initial evaluation will be evaluated within 60 days.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

Following the measurement requirement for this indicator, the following Table shows data collected from each LEA for reporting period July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012:

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	313	313	100%
Kosrae	21	21	100%
Pohnpei	120	120	100%
Yap	91	91	100%
FSM Total	545	545	100%

Data Source: The evaluation data were taken from the LEA Local Performance Plans (LPPs) and verified through the FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS) database system of all children for whom a parental consent to evaluate was received for the report year July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012.

There were 545 parental consents for initial evaluation received for this reporting period. Of the 545 parental consents for initial evaluation, 100% (545/545) of the initial evaluations were completed within 60 days of receiving parental consent.

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

FSM demonstrated 100% (545/545) compliance in FFY 2011 for Indicator 11, maintaining 100% compliance as in the previous year.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

OSEP FFY 2010 APR Response Table, June 2012

OSEP appreciates FSM's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).

OSEP Memorandum 13-6, December 2012

OSEP provided additional instructions in an effort to reduce reporting burden. For the FFY 2011 APR, States:

- 7) Are not required to provide an explanation of: a) progress; b) no change in actual target data from the data for FFY 2010; or c) slippage if the State meets its target.
- 8) Are not required to discuss improvement activities for: a) compliance indicators where the State reports 100% compliance for FFY 2011; and b) results indicators where the State has met its FFY 2011 target.
- 9) May provide one set of improvement activities for the entire APR as long as the Improvement Activities are indexed back to reference the relevant indicators.

For Indicator 11, FSM met the target of 100% compliance and therefore is not required to provide an explanation of progress or slippage and a discussion on improvement activities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-2013: This is a compliance indicator therefore targets will not be adjusted.

FSM will continue to implement the SPP Improvement Activities for Indicator 11, as indicated below:

Status of Improvement Activities

Improvement Activity 1: **System Category: Administration and Monitoring**
Continue implementation of the FSM *Continuous Improvement* Monitoring System and Local level monitoring procedures, with a continued focus on tracking and monitoring the child identification and evaluation process, 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 not in noncompliance with this Indicator measurement.

Status: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012

Improvement Activity 2: **System Category: TA/Training/Professional Development**
Facilitate LEA training for staff and parents regarding the Child Find requirements for identification, referral, evaluation, and eligibility of all students with disabilities. Trainings will also focus on assessment and diagnostic evaluation tools and processes.

Status: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012

Improvement Activity 3: **System Category: Collaboration and Coordination**
Facilitate sharing of resources and expertise assistance within LEAs to support Child Find, Diagnostic, and Evaluation priority activities across FSM.

Status: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

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
2011 (2011-2012)	100% of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP 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 is 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.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

Following the measurement requirement for this indicator, the Table below displays data collected from each LEA for reporting period July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012:

All Youth with IEPs Age 16 and Above for the Reporting Year 2011-2012

LEA	(a)	(b)	(c)
	# of Youth with an IEP aged 16 and above.	# in (a) that had sufficient evidence in the IEP of having the 8 elements of the NSTTAC Indicator 13 Checklist.	Percent = (b) divided by (a) times 100.
Chuuk	93	93	100%
Kosrae	17	17	100%
Pohnpei	138	138	100%
Yap	51	51	100%
TOTAL	299	299	299/299 = 100%

Data Source: The secondary transition data were taken from the LEA Local Performance Plan (LPP) and verified through the completed Transition Services Record Review Summary forms of all youth with IEPs aged 16 and above for the report year July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

FSM demonstrated 100% (299/299) compliance in FFY 2011 for Indicator 13, maintaining 100% compliance as in the previous year.

OSEP FFY 2010 APR Determination Letter, June 2012

OSEP appreciates FSM's efforts in achieving compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b).

OSEP Memorandum 13-6, December 2012

OSEP provided additional instructions in an effort to reduce reporting burden. For the FFY 2011 APR, States:

- 1) Are not required to provide an explanation of: a) progress; b) no change in actual target data from the data for FFY 2010; or c) slippage if the State meets its target.
- 2) Are not required to discuss improvement activities for: a) compliance indicators where the State reports 100% compliance for FFY 2011; and b) results indicators where the State has met its FFY 2011 target.
- 3) May provide one set of improvement activities for the entire APR as long as the Improvement Activities are indexed back to reference the relevant indicators.

For Indicator 13, FSM met compliance and therefore is not required to provide an explanation of progress or slippage and a discussion on improvement activities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-2013: This is a compliance indicator therefore targets will not be adjusted.

FSM will continue to implement the SPP Improvement Activities for Indicator 13, as indicated below:

Status of Improvement Activities

Improvement Activity 1: System Category: Improving Data Collection and Reporting.
FSM NDOE to revise the Secondary Transition procedures to include additional requirements and revised data collection process and forms consistent with this Indicator requirement for implementation.

Status: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012

Improvement Activity 2: System Category: TA/Training/ Professional Development
Provide training on revised secondary transition procedures and process and data collection forms.

Status: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012

Improvement Activity 3: System Category: Improving Data Collection and Reporting
Update the SITs to align with the eight data elements from the NSTTAC checklist.

Status: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (2011-2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. 14% of youth in higher education within one year of leaving high school. B. 27% of youth in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. C. 35% of youth 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.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

Based on the IDEA 618 Table 4 Exit Data submitted for FFY 2010, FSM reported 56 youth with IEPs left high school: 37 graduated with a high school diploma, 13 dropped out, and 6 reached maximum age. These 56 youth with IEPs who exited high school were considered "leavers" and tracked one year after leaving high school to assess their post-school outcomes for this indicator. Table 1 displays by LEAs the post-school outcome survey respondents from the 56 leavers in FFY 2010. As shown, 96% (54/56) of the FFY 2010 leavers responded to the post-school outcome survey, which was representative of FSM's leavers.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Table 1: Percentage of FFY 2010 Leavers Who were Respondents for 2011-2012 Survey

LEA	(a) # of Leavers (Based on the FFY 2010 618 Table 4)	(b) # of Leavers Who Responded to the One-Year Follow-Up	(c) % Respondents (b) divided by (a) times 100
Chuuk	15	15	15/15 x 100 = 100%
Kosrae	10	10	10/10 x 100 = 100%
Pohnpei	23	21	21/23 x 100 = 91%
Yap	8	8	8/8 x 100 = 100%
FSM Return Rate	56	54	96% (54/56)

Data Source: The leavers data were taken from FSM's 618 Table 4 "exit" data reported for FFY 2010 and verified through the Student Information Tracking System (SITS) database system. The post-school outcomes data were from utilizing the Post Secondary Outcome (PSO) survey reported in each LEA's Local Performance Plan (LPP).

Table 2: 2011-2012 # Respondents in the following Post-School Outcome (PSO) Areas:

(a) State	(b) # of Respondents (from Table 1(b))	(c) Respondents in One of the Following Areas after One Year of Leaving Secondary School, following the PSO Survey				
		(1) # enrolled in higher education	(2) # competitively employed.	(3) # postsecondary education or training	(4) # other employed	(5) # other or Not Engaged
Chuuk	15	4	1	0	1	9
Kosrae	10	1	1	0	0	8
Pohnpei	21	7	2	0	8	4
Yap	8	2	2	0	0	4
TOTAL	54	14	6	0	9	25

Definitions

The following definitions are specific to FSM's Part B Indicator 14, listed in Table 2:

- Competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.
- Higher Education means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (2-year program), or college/university (4- or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.
- Some Other Employment means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).
- Other postsecondary education or training means youth enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least one complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, or vocational technical school which is less than a 2-year program).
- Respondents are youth or their designated family member who answer the survey or interview questions.
- Leavers are youth who left school by graduating with a regular or modified diploma, aging out, left school early (i.e., dropped out), or who were expected to return and did not.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Percentage of Respondents in the Three Indicator Measures:

Reporting Year	# of Respondents (from Table 1(b))	Percentage of Respondents in the Three Indicator Measurement Areas:		
		(A)	(B)	(C)
		Table 2 (c)(1) divided by total # respondents from Table 1(b) times 100	Table 2 (c)(1)+(2) divided by total # respondents from Table 1(b) times 100	Table 2 (c)(1)+(2)+(3)+(4) divided by total # respondents from Table 1(b) times 100
2011-2012	54	14/54 x 100 = 26%	(14 + 6)/54 x 100 = 37%	(14+6+0+9)/54 x 100 = 54%

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

FSM met its targets and demonstrated progress in all 3 measurements from previous year's reporting:

Measurement A: FSM exceed the target of 14% for this measurement with a performance is **26%** or 14 out of 54 youth with IEPs in higher education within one year of leaving high school, representing progress from last year's performance of 17.3% (9/52).

Measurement B: FSM exceed the target of 27% for this measurement with a performance of **37%** or 20 out of 54 youth with IEPs in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school, representing progress from last year's performance of 28.8% (15/52).

Measurement C: FSM exceeded the target of 35% for this reporting period with a performance of **54%** or 29 out of 54 youth with IEPs 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. This represents progress from last year's performance of 42.3% (22/52).

OSEP FFY 2010 APR Response Table, June 2012

OSEP appreciates FSM's efforts to improve performance.

OSEP Memorandum 13-6, December 2012

OSEP provided additional instructions in an effort to reduce reporting burden. For the FFY 2011 APR, States:

- 10) Are not required to provide an explanation of: a) progress; b) no change in actual target data from the data for FFY 2010; or c) slippage if the State meets its target.
- 11) Are not required to discuss improvement activities for: a) compliance indicators where the State reports 100% compliance for FFY 2011; and b) results indicators where the State has met its FFY 2011 target.
- 12) May provide one set of improvement activities for the entire APR as long as the Improvement Activities are indexed back to reference the relevant indicators.

For Indicator 14, FSM met its targets and therefore is not required to provide an explanation of progress or slippage and a discussion on improvement activities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-2013:

FSM will continue to implement the SPP Improvement Activities for Indicator 14, as indicated below:

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Status of Improvement Activities

Improvement Activity 1: System Category: Administration and Monitoring
FSM NDOE will facilitate a working group to gather input for expanding the post school outcome survey.

Status: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012

Improvement Activity 2: System Category: TA/Training/Professional Development
Provide training on revised survey and other related guidelines to special education coordinators and staff.

Status: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012

Improvement Activity 3: System Category: Administration and Monitoring
Provide training on revised secondary transition procedures and process for data collection and reporting. (Same as Indicator 13, Improvement Activity #2)

Status: Continuing Activity through FFY 2012

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (2011-2012)	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 2011 (2011-2012):

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, FSM 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. The FSM National Department of Education (NDOE) serves as the State Education Agency (SEA) responsible for the general supervision of special education and related services delivered in the four island states of Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap through their Departments of Education, known as the Local Education Agencies (LEAs).

As instructed, FSM utilized the OSEP B15 Worksheet to document the verified correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010.

PART B INDICATOR 15 WORKSHEET

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEA Issued Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	(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 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.	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

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEA Issued Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
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	3	60	60
	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	0	0	0
	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 the post-secondary goals.	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
Other areas of noncompliance: Related to LEA system/program areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Records Management • Case Review Management • Data Management/System • Transportation Management • Interagency Agreement 	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	3	8	8
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			68	68
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.			100%	

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Process for Monitoring:

In FFY 2010, 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 an on-site monitoring/verification visit to 3 of the 4 LEAs: Chuuk, Pohnpei, and Yap, which resulted in findings of noncompliance. The on-site visit to the fourth LEA, Kosrae, was scheduled for December 2011. The results of the Kosrae on-site visit will be reported in the FFY 2012 APR.

As reported in the FFY 2010 APR, FSM met 100% compliance with Indicators 11 and 13. In addition, FSM NDOE did not receive any formal complaints or due process requests, as reported in the FFY 2010 APR for Indicators 16 and 17.

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

In FFY 2011, FSM demonstrated 100% (68/68) compliance with Indicator 15, as shown in the B15 Worksheet. The breakdown of verified timely correction as follows:

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Timely Corrected (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance FSM made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator B15 Worksheet)	68
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)	68
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
2. Number of findings FSM has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent)

Verification of correction reported in the B15 Worksheet showed a total of 68 FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance timely corrected (within one year from identification of noncompliance). FSM reported the number of findings based on individual child-specific noncompliance and system/program noncompliance. Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, FSM ensured that verification of correction for child-specific noncompliance was done for each child-specific instances found to be in noncompliance, as well as verification of additional data demonstrating 100% for the regulatory requirement. For the system issued findings, FSM ensured verification of correction through a review of required LEA policies, procedures, and practices demonstrating correct implementation of the requirements.

Following the B15 Worksheet, the total findings reported and verified as corrected were as follows:

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Indicator 5: Three LEAs issued a total of 60 findings of noncompliance

In FFY 2010, a total of 60 findings of noncompliance related to IEPs were issued to Chuuk, Pohnpei, and Yap. Chuuk was issued 42 findings, Pohnpei 6 findings, and Yap received 12 findings of noncompliance. The findings of noncompliance were based on individual IEP file reviews and verification of service delivery. In Chuuk, 40 findings were related to the IEPs not including the required documentation for frequency, duration, or location of services and evaluation summaries/reports. The other 2 findings of noncompliance issued to Chuuk were related to the consistency of services delivered based on the IEP. The 6 findings issued to Pohnpei and 12 findings to Yap were related to the consistency of services delivered based on the IEP.

Actions Taken to Verify Correction

NDOE verified timely correction of the 60 findings of noncompliance related to IEPs, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. NDOE ensured that the individual child-specific instances of noncompliance were corrected and additional data demonstrated 100% compliance with the regulatory requirements. NDOE required the 3 LEAs to provide copies of the corrected IEPs and subsequent IEPs for other students to determine that the LEAs were implementing the regulatory requirement correctly. In addition, follow-up on-site verification visit was conducted for each LEA to verify the timely correction of the findings of noncompliance. A review of the IEP files confirmed that the individual instances were corrected and that the LEAs were implementing the regulatory requirements correctly. Verification of the consistency in services provided based on the IEP was conducted through a review of the IEPs and written service delivery logs. **FSM verified that all 60 findings were timely corrected.**

Other: Three LEAs issued a total of 8 findings of noncompliance

Chuuk, Pohnpei, and Yap were issued findings of noncompliance related to system issues/noncompliance in the areas of local monitoring/case reviews, data management/system, transportation management, and interagency agreement.

Actions Taken to Verify Correction

FSM verified timely correction of the 8 system findings issued to Chuuk, Pohnpei, and Yap through a review of the documentation provided by the LEAs to address the system issues identified in their corrective action plans, as follows:

- **Chuuk**: Three (3) system findings were issued related to the implementation of the FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS) not being fully implemented and case review meetings not fully implemented on a bi-weekly basis. There was also no manual back-up system to provide an accurate accounting of active students served or the status of pending referrals. Verification of correction required Chuuk to provide a report that documented pending and active cases, including an amended accurate Child Count prior to January 15, 2011. Chuuk submitted the required reports and NDOE verified that the 3 system findings of noncompliance were timely corrected.
- **Pohnpei**: Four (4) system findings were issued related to records management, case reviews, and transportation management. For the records management finding, records were found not to be fully reviewed for accuracy prior to the SITS entry. The lack of record reviews was also due to the inconsistency in implementing the case reviews. The corrective action required Pohnpei to submit written procedures for implementing records management and case review meetings. The transportation management finding related to daily transportation, fuel and maintenance logs not being consistently completed and reported to the Coordinator of the program. Pohnpei was required to submit for correction a summary report form for supervisors to use to summarize daily trip logs for each vehicle, fuel consumption compared to number of miles driven each week, and vehicle maintenance. Pohnpei was also required to submit for correction written procedures requiring the transportation supervisors to submit monthly reports to the Special Education Coordinator that certifies transportation services being delivered and fuel consumption consistent with the number of miles logged. Pohnpei submitted the required documentation and NDOE verified that the evidence provided showed timely correction of the 4 system findings of noncompliance.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

- Yap: One (1) system finding was issued related to Interagency Agreement. The Interagency Agreement between the Yap Department of Education Special Education Program, Early Childhood Education (ECE) Program, and Yap Department of Health/Maternal and Child Health Care-Children with Special Health Needs (MCH-CSHN) was found not to be fully implemented. Yap was required to submit a copy of the revised Interagency Agreement. NDOE received the required documentation and verified that the evidence provided showed timely correction of the 1 system finding of noncompliance.

OSEP FFY 2010 APR Response Table, June 2012

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps	FSM's Response
<p>FSM must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 that was not reported as corrected in the FFY 2010 APR was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP stated that FSM did not demonstrate that it corrected the one finding under Indicator 11 in Yap State because correction was not verified consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p>	<p>FSM reports that the one system finding issued to Yap State was corrected, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The corrective action based on the monitoring report issued to Yap State required Yap State to provide training on the preschool screening tool. The training was conducted for special education personnel and early childhood teachers, which increased the pool of trained personnel. The early childhood teachers were from the Early Childhood Education (ECE) Program, a typical setting where young children with and without disabilities attend preschool classes.</p> <p>Additional information gathered to serve as evidence that the increased personnel trained impacted the screening capacity of Yap State was the number of screenings conducted by the ECE teachers. At the beginning of each school year, the preschool screeners are used to assess preschoolers who might be at-risk for developmental delays. The results of the screening are considered "intakes" or referrals for possible evaluation, a component of the special education process.</p> <p>In FFY 2010, the increased pool of personnel trained resulted in 4 screenings conducted, with the 4 preschoolers screened provided further assessments for eligibility determination. All 4 preschoolers were determined eligible for special education services. In FFY 2011, the screening increased to 100 completed screenings; of which, 6 preschoolers were determined eligible for special education services.</p> <p>The additional information on the use of the screening tool by the special education and early childhood personnel serves as evidence that the system finding issued to Yap State was verified corrected, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>
<p>OSEP appreciates FSM's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, FSM's data demonstrating that FSM timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>	<p>As described within Indicator 15, FSM verified timely correction of all FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance.</p>
<p>When reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2011 APR, FSM must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 and FFY 2009: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data</p>	<p>Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, FSM reported verified timely correction of each individual child-specific noncompliance and correct implementation by the LEAs of the specific regulatory requirement through the review of subsequent data demonstrating 100% compliance with the specific regulatory requirement. In addition, FSM reported verified timely correction of findings related to each LEA's capacity to manage program requirements, including records management, case review management, data system management, transportation management, and interagency agreement. As described within Indicator 15, FSM provided the specific</p>

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps	FSM's Response
subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, FSM must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.	actions taken to verify the correction for both the individual child-specific noncompliance findings and the system noncompliance findings.
In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, FSM must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.	FSM used the Indicator 15 Worksheet to determine the Actual Target for this Indicator.

OSEP Memorandum 13-6, December 2012

OSEP provided additional instructions in an effort to reduce reporting burden. For the FFY 2011 APR, States:

- 13) Are not required to provide an explanation of: a) progress; b) no change in actual target data from the data for FFY 2010; or c) slippage if the State meets its target.
- 14) Are not required to discuss improvement activities for: a) compliance indicators where the State reports 100% compliance for FFY 2011; and b) results indicators where the State has met its FFY 2011 target.
- 15) May provide one set of improvement activities for the entire APR as long as the Improvement Activities are indexed back to reference the relevant indicators.

For Indicator 15, FSM met its target of 100% compliance and therefore is not required to provide an explanation of progress or slippage and a discussion on improvement activities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-2013: This is a compliance target therefore targets will not be adjusted.

At this time, there are no revisions to the improvement activities for this Indicator. FSM will continue to implement the SPP Improvement Activities for Indicator 15, as indicated below:

Status of Improvement Activities

Improvement Activity 1: System Category: Administration and Monitoring
Continue implementation of the FSM-NDOE *Continuous Improvement Monitoring System*, including the review of completion/resolution timeline requirements for complaints, mediation, and due process hearing requests, 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.

Status: Continuing Through FFY 2012

Improvement Activity 2: System Category: TA/Training/Professional Development
Facilitate LEA training for staff and parents regarding the procedural safeguards notice, with particular focus on the local operational and documentation procedures for full implementation, including the review of the timeline requirements for the resolution of complaints, mediation, and due process hearing requests.

Status: Continuing Through FFY 2012

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

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.

Table with 2 columns: FFY, Measurable and Rigorous Target. Row 1: 2011 (2011-2012), Targets will be set once required baseline data available (10 or greater).

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

FSM did not receive hearing requests in 2011-2012, as reflected in FSM's IDEA 618 Table 7.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

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.

Table with 2 columns: FFY, Measurable and Rigorous Target. Row 1: 2011 (2011-2012), Targets will be set once required baseline data available (10 or greater).

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

FSM did not receive requests for hearings or mediations in 2011-2012, as reflected in FSM's IDEA 618 Table 7.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

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, State Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Reports, are

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (first Wednesday in February for child count, including race and ethnicity; and educational environments; first Wednesday in November for exiting, discipline, personnel and dispute resolution; and May 1 for Maintenance of Effort & Coordinated Early Intervening Services; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (2011-2012)	100% FSM reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

As indicated in the Overview of this APR, FSM chooses to wait for OSEP's calculation of FSM's compliance with Indicator 20 requirements. As communicated by OSEP during the December 2012 TA call, states/entities will have an opportunity to respond to OSEP's Indicator 20 calculation during "clarification" period anticipated in April 2013.

OSEP's FFY 2011 Part B SPP/APR Status Table and Indicator 20 Rubric calculated FSM's performance for Indicator 20 at 91.15% compliance with Indicator 20 requirements. FSM provided clarification for 3B and 7 based on OSEP's Status Table and requests that OSEP give FSM the points for "correct calculation" for these two APR Indicators. In addition, for the 618 Tables 3 and 5, FSM requests re-consideration of the "complete data" and "passed edit check" points for FSM's Indicator 20. The following clarification is provided, as in previous years, related to the 618 Tables:

FSM completed and submit all data reports and APR in a timely manner. FSM continues to use the following data note in its 618 data submissions that require data concerning "English Language Proficiency (ELP)":

"FSM continues to use " -9 " under the English Language Proficiency (ELP) data cells for Table 3, 5, and 6. At this time, the FSM Department of Education does not have a method for determining English Language Proficiency. FSM does not conduct formal language assessment for students. Students in the FSM enter school speaking a vernacular language from their island. They do not speak any English. There are many different vernacular languages spoken in the FSM. Instruction in the vernacular is practiced for grades 1-3. In the 3rd grade, English is introduced as a 2nd language. As students progress past the 3rd grade, English is used to a greater extent.

FSM continues to prioritize the issue of English language acquisition for students in the FSM. Given the many indigenous languages spoken as children begin school, English is a common official second language for the FSM. FSM will be conducting training on implementing TESL programs and included in this effort will be the identification of an English Language assessment instrument for FSM LEAs to be able to determine English Language proficiency for all students.
