

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

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 2012-2013 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 2013-September 2013, each LEA convened their special education advisory panel for the development of their IDEA Part B LPP for school year 2013-2014. The LPP follows the same indicator measurement 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 2012 data for each SPP/LPP Indicator and implementation of improvement priorities for school year 2012-2013. In addition, the SPP/APR requirements, with a copy of the OSEP FFY 2011 APR Determination Letter and Response Table, dated July 1, 2013, were shared as part 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 2011 APR Determination Letter, July 1, 2013

As noted in the letter, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) determined that, under IDEA section 616(d)(2)(A)(i), FSM **meets the requirements** of Part B of the IDEA. The Department's determination was based on the totality of FSM's data and information, including the FSM's FFY 2011 APR and revised SPP, other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

In addition to the LEA LPP development and review, the FSM National SPP/APR Committee convened to review the compiled aggregated LEA data and information for inclusion into the overall FSM 2012-2013 APR. The following sessions were held:

- **March 4-6, 2013**: NDOE and San Diego State University (SDSU) facilitated a Student Information Tracking System (SITS) data training in Pohnpei for all LEA data managers. This training provided LEAs the opportunity to ensure child specific and system data reported in their LPP and other LEA reports are consistent and valid. During the training, there was a review of the SITS user's guide and the revised Special Education Procedural Manual, which contains the specific processes and timelines for data input into the SITS.
- **September 25-27, 2013**: The FSM National SPP/APR committee meeting was held in Pohnpei to review 2012-2013 performance from each LEA's 2013-2014 LPP. The four LEA LPP data aggregated at the SEA/National-level served as the basis for the FSM 2012-2013 APR. In addition, an overview of the new SPP requirements and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) was presented to the 33 meeting participants, representing the four LEAs and SEA. LEA meeting participants represented the LEA Advisory Panel, LEA parent networks, as well as

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

service providers. Guam CEDDERS provided off-site technical assistance and resource documents to assist in facilitation of meeting.

The FSM National SPP/APR committee reviewed 2012-2013 progress data from the LEAs' 2013-2014 LPP and assessed implementation implications of the improvement activities. SEA priorities were then identified based on common issues and challenges from the LEAs' implementation of 2012-2013 improvement activities. Recommended priority areas were verified based on LEA performance data and incorporated into the FSM FFY 2012 APR.

- **October 29-November 1, 2013**: A FSM team comprised of the NDOE Special Education Director, staff, and the LEA Special Education Coordinators participated in the Western Regional Resource Center (WRRC) Regional Forum. The forum provided an opportunity for the FSM team to network with other state representatives on improvement activity priorities and reporting. The forum also provided an opportunity to learn more about the proposed new SPP and OSEP's focus on results for reporting through the development of the SSIP.
- **January 21-24, 2014**: The FSM National SPP/APR committee convened in Pohnpei to review OSEP's final instructions, OSEP Memorandum 14-2, for the FFY 2012 SPP/APR development. With technical support from Guam CEDDERS, over 30 representatives from the four LEAs and NDOE Special Education Program reviewed FSM's data and information for inclusion into FSM's FFY 2012 SPP/APR due to OSEP no later than February 3, 2014. The recommended priority areas identified during the September 25-27, 2013 SPP/APR meeting were also finalized based on verified LEA performance data. The meeting also included a discussion on the considerations for reporting consistent with OSEP Memorandum 14-2.

OSEP Memorandum 14-2, October 2013

OSEP Memorandum 14-2 provided additional instructions for the development of the FFY 2012 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 November 2013 TA call, states/entities will have an opportunity to respond to OSEP's Indicator 20 calculation during "clarification" period anticipated in April/May 2014.
- **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 with reference to each indicator.

With OSEP's additional instructions in Memorandum 14-2, **FSM's Part B FFY 2012 APR includes actual target data and required discussion for 14 of the 20 SPP Indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18, and 19.** The 6 SPP Indicators not in this APR include: 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 for FSM to respond to, if needed.

As indicated earlier, FSM will continue to utilize the same Improvement Activity format by individual indicators for this APR submission. Although FFY 2012 represents the last reporting year of the FFY 2005-2012 SPP, FSM will continue to report on the status of each improvement activity, including the continuation, if appropriate, of the improvement activity in FFY 2013.

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

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

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

FSM has posted its complete revised SPP, which includes any revisions to the SPP based on the FFY 2011 APR submission in 2013, on the following FSM NDOE websites: <http://www.fsmed.fm> and <http://www.fsmsped.org/dashboard>.

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 2012-2013 APR, NDOE will implement the following public dissemination:

1. By February 14, 2014, 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.
2. By June 2, 2014, NDOE, Special Education Program will post the FSM IDEA FFY 2012 Part B APR and updated SPP 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/May 2014 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 June 2, 2014, 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 FFY 2012 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 June 16, 2014, a summary of the FSM IDEA FFY 2012 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 2012

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 |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 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 2012 APR, use data from 2011-2012). Therefore, for Indicator 1, the target and actual data for FFY 2011 will be the FFY 2010 data. |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 82% of youth with IEP's will graduate with a high school diploma. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (2012-2013): As per OSEP's instruction, Actual Target Data will be the actual data from FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

As one of the Freely Associated States (FAS), FSM does not report graduation data to the Department under Title 1 of the ESEA. FSM therefore continues to use the senior enrollment calculation to determine FSM's annual graduation rate for youth with IEPs graduating with a regular high school diploma. The total number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular high school diploma is consistent with the 618 reported exit data for FFY 2011.

FSM's overall National data for FFY 2011 (2011-2012) of **82%** (84/103) met the SPP target of 82%. The Table below lists the 103 seniors with IEPs across the four LEAs; of which 84 out of 103 or 82% graduated with a regular high school diploma.

Actual data by LEAs for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

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 | 26 | 26 | 100% |
| KOSRAE | 10 | 6 | 60% |
| POHNPEI | 45 | 33 | 73% |
| YAP | 22 | 19 | 86% |
| TOTAL | 103 | 84 | 84/103 x 100 = 82% |

*Data Source: IDEA 618 Table 4 Data Report for FFY 2011

Data Collection: FSM Special Education verifies data reported by each LEA from the FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS), including senior enrollment.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Graduation Requirements: "Graduation with a high school diploma" is defined in the FSM as the completion of required course credits during high school, with each 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 = 22 credits for Yap High and 24 credits for Yap Outer Island and Yap Neighboring Island Central High Schools. These requirements are consistent for students with and without disabilities.

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

As per OSEP's instructions, for this APR, FSM reports FFY 2011 (2011-2012) data and compares it to FSM FFY 2011 (2011-2012) target.

FSM's overall National data for FFY 2011 (2011-2012) of 82% (84/103) met the SPP target of 82%. Although this represents a slippage when comparing the percentage of graduates in FFY 2011 (82% or 84/103) and FFY 2010 (90% or 37/41), the total number of seniors with IEPs and total number of seniors with IEPs that graduated with a regular diploma increased by 62 and 47, respectively.

OSEP Memorandum 14-2, October 2013

OSEP provided additional instructions in an effort to reduce reporting burden. For the FFY 2012 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 2011; 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 2012; and b) results indicators where the State has met its FFY 2012 target.

For Indicator 1, 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 2013-2014:

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.

As indicated on page 2 of this APR, although FFY 2012 represents the last reporting year of the FFY 2005-2012 SPP, FSM will continue to report on the status of each improvement activity, including the continuation, if appropriate, of the improvement activity in FFY 2013.

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.

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

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

each grade level, for graduation. Student progress data will assist each LEA to provide appropriate intervention, as needed.

Status: Continuing Activity.

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.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

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 2012 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 Memorandum 14-2, APR Instructions, October 2013

OSEP provided additional instructions for Indicator 2. For the FFY 2012 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 October 2013 additional instructions, **FSM has chosen to utilize the same data source and measurement used in its FFY 2010 APR for its FFY 2012 Indicator 2 reporting.** The following sections therefore are based on the FFY 2010 APR Indicator 2 measurement guidance:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 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 2012 APR, use data from 2011-2012). Therefore, for Indicator 2, the target and actual data for FFY 2012 will be the FFY 2011 data. |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 2% of youth with IEPs drop out of high school. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (2012-2013): As per OSEP’s instruction, Actual Target Data will be the actual data from FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

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 2011 was 8% (33/397). 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 are as follows:

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

FSM Breakdown of LEA Drop-Out Rates

| 2011-2012 School Year | # & % of Youth with IEPs who Dropped Out in FSM | | |
|--------------------------|---|-------------|--------------------------|
| | # 9 th -12 th Graders | # Drop-Outs | % Drop-Outs |
| CHUUK | 105 | 14 | 13% |
| KOSRAE | 41 | 6 | 15% |
| POHNPEI | 178 | 0 | 0% |
| YAP | 73 | 13 | 18% |
| TOTAL | 397 | 33 | 33/397 x 100 = 8% |

Actual data by LEAs for FFY 2008 through FFY 2011:

The following tables show comparison data from FFY 2008 through 2011 for each LEA:

CHUUK:

| CHUUK State | # & % Drop-Outs in Chuuk | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| | 2008-2009 | | | 2009-2010 | | | 2010-2011 | | | 2011-2012 | | |
| | #9-12 th Graders | #Drop- Outs | %Drop- Outs |
| Youth with IEPs | 53 | 9 | 17% | 48 | 3 | 6% | 35 | 2 | 5.7% | 105 | 14 | 13% |

KOSRAE:

| KOSRAE State | # & % Drop-Outs in Kosrae | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| | 2008-2009 | | | 2009-2010 | | | 2010-2011 | | | 2011-2012 | | |
| | #9-12 th Graders | #Drop- Outs | %Drop- Outs |
| Youth with IEPs | 48 | 6 | 12.5% | 51 | 6 | 12% | 41 | 7 | 17% | 41 | 6 | 15% |

POHNPEI:

| POHNPEI State | # & % Drop-Outs in Pohnpei | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| | 2008-2009 | | | 2009-2010 | | | 2010-2011 | | | 2011-2012 | | |
| | #9-12 th Graders | #Drop- Outs | %Drop- Outs |
| Youth with IEPs | 183 | 8 | 4.4% | 219 | 0 | 0% | 286 | 1 | .3% | 178 | 0 | 0% |

YAP:

| YAP State | # & % Drop-Outs in Yap | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| | 2008-2009 | | | 2009-2010 | | | 2010-2011 | | | 2011-2012 | | |
| | #9-12 th Graders | #Drop- Outs | %Drop- Outs |
| Youth with IEPs | 52 | 3 | 5.8% | 44 | 0 | 0% | 52 | 3 | 5.8% | 73 | 13 | 18% |

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

As per OSEP's instructions, for this APR, FSM reports FFY 2011 (2011-2012) data and compares the data to FSM's FFY 2011 (2011-2012) target.

FSM target for FFY 2011 was 2%. FSM's actual data for FFY 2011 was 8% (33/397), which represents slippage from 3% (13/414) in FFY 2010. FSM did not meet its target for FFY 2011.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

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 (SDSU) 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 (RTI) workshop held in Chuuk State in April 2011 and the FSM Association of Chief State School Officers (FACSSO) endorsement of the Rtl Initiative through FACSSO 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.

SDSU assisted the FSM in developing its first RTI Handbook that aligns with the FSM Special Education Procedural Manual. Training on the new RTI Handbook was held in Yap State in July 2012 for teachers and administrators for both general and special education programs. Training modules were also developed and provided to each state. The FSM and SDSU facilitated trainings on the Special Education Procedural Manual for all special education teachers and administrators in all the four states. The training was conducted for Chuuk and Pohnpei on June 17-22, 2013; and Kosrae and Yap on July 18-26, 2013. One of the focuses for the training was on developing education and related services that ensure student success.

With support from Guam CEDDERS, the Regional Resource Center Program (RRCP) facilitated a 5-day training on *Thinking Through Collaboration* on February 25 – March 1, 2013 at the University of Guam. The training was designed for an education team of both general education and special education educators to build their knowledge and skills for collaboration and to use data-decision making processes that ensure education success for all students. The FSM team included representatives from the NDOE and FSM states' RTI pilot school teams. The NDOE and each of the FSM States were provided with the training materials to replicate the same training at their respective states.

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 2011 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).

'12-'13 Progress: Continuing Activity: A data training facilitated by SDSU on the Student Information Tracking System (SITS) was held in Pohnpei State on March 4-6, 2013. Part of the training objectives included the procedures for terminating records from the SITS and using the termination case report for decision-making that will impact services for students with disabilities.

In August 2013, National Special Education participated in a data system review and development meeting titled "Performance Indicators and Data Quality Assessment" facilitated by Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) in Pohnpei. Education Management Information System (EMIS) used by NDOE and the Pacific Education Data Management System (PEDMS) used by the FSM State DOEs were reviewed and definitions and

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

processes for collecting information such as 'drop out' were included in the review.

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.

'12-'13 Progress: **Continuing Activity:** 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 were reviewed for accuracy and issues related to procedural and special education service implementation were discussed with recommended improvement activities incorporated into LEA LPPs.

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.

'12-'13 Progress: **Continuing Activity:** Training on the new RTI handbook was conducted for general and special education teachers, administrators, and other department of education staff from all LEAs. This training was held in Yap State in July 2012.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2013-2014:

As indicated on page 2 of this APR, although FFY 2012 represents the last reporting year of the FFY 2005-2012 SPP, FSM will continue to report on the status of each improvement activity, including the continuation, if appropriate, of the improvement activity in FFY 2013. FSM indicated the status of the improvement activities within the Discussion Section.

In addition, FSM would like to acknowledge that the improvement activities for Indicators 1, 4, 13, and 14 will greatly support FSM to 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.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

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: EDFacts 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: EDFacts file specifications N/X075 and N/X078.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|---|
| 2012 (2012-2013) | <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 2012 (2012-2013):

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.

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. The Spring 2013 Math NMCT was administered to all students with and

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

without disabilities in grades 4, 6, 8, and 10 in all LEAs, with exception of Chuuk State. Chuuk Department of Education did not administer 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. NDOE continues to plan for and provide ongoing support to the LEAs to ensure timely administration, collection, analysis, and reporting of assessment data to NDOE.

The Spring 2013 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 2012-2013 – Participation

| 2012-2013 National Minimum Competency Test (NMCT) | | 3B. PARTICIPATION: MATH Assessment | | | | | |
|---|---|--|------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| | | Grade 4 | Grade 6 | Grade 8 | Grade 10 | TOTAL | |
| | | | | | | # | % |
| a. | Children with IEPs | 187 | 218 | 171 | 90 | 666 | |
| b. | Regular assess with NO accommodations | 11 | 7 | 18 | 4 | 40 | 6% |
| c. | Regular assess with accommodations | 46 | 63 | 48 | 21 | 178 | 27% |
| d. | AA against grade-level academic achievement standards | FSM does not have an alternate assessment (AA) that tests children against grade-level academic achievement standards. | | | | | |
| e. | AA against modified academic achievement standards | FSM does not have an AA that tests children against modified academic achievement standards. | | | | | |
| f. | AA against alternate academic achievement standards | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 1% |
| Overall: [(b+c+d+e+f) divided by a] | | 33% | 33% | 40% | 30% | 228 | 34% |
| Children with IEPs included in "a" but not included in the other subcategories: | | | | | | | |
| Absent | | 125 | 147 | 103 | 63 | 438 | 66% |

618 Table 6: Statewide Reading Assessment for SY 2012-2013 – Participation

| 2012-2013 National Minimum Competency Test (NMCT) | | 3B. PARTICIPATION: READING Assessment | | | | |
|---|---|--|------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| | | Grade 6 | Grade 8 | Grade 10 | TOTAL | |
| | | | | | # | % |
| a. | Children with IEPs | 212 | 151 | 90 | 453 | |
| b. | Regular assess with NO accommodations | 7 | 18 | 4 | 29 | 6.4% |
| c. | Regular assess with accommodations | 57 | 30 | 21 | 108 | 24% |
| 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 | 0 | 2 | 3 | .6% |
| Overall: [(b+c+d+e+f) divided by a] | | 31% | 31% | 30% | 140 | 31% |
| Children with IEPs included in "a" but not included in the other subcategories: | | | | | | |
| Absent | | 147 | 103 | 63 | 313 | 69% |

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

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 2012-2013 – Proficiency

| 2012-2013 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) | 62 | 71 | 68 | 27 | 228 | |
| 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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| Overall: [(b+c+d+e+f) divided by a] | | 3% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 2 | .9% |

618 Table 6: Statewide Reading Assessment for SY 2012-2013 – Proficiency

| 2012-2013 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) | 65 | 48 | 27 | 140 | |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| Overall: [(b+c+d+e+f) divided by a] | | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0 | 0% |

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 2012

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 prepared by NDOE's Division of Basic Education and Accreditation did not account for the manual verification of results conducted by NDOE's Division of Special Services, 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 2012 (2012-2013):

FSM did not meet its FFY 2012 participation target of 100%. FSM's actual participation data showed slippage in both Math and Reading from the previous year's reporting. For Math, FSM's performance went from 62% (300/484) in FFY 2011 to 34% (228/666) in FFY 2012. For Reading, FSM's performance was 59% (227/385) in FFY 2011 compared to 31% (140/453) in FFY 2012. As discussed earlier, this slippage can be attributed to the administration oversights in two of the LEAs. FSM noted these issues and will continue to work closely with test administrators at both SEA and LEA levels to resolve such issues before and during the next administration of the NMCT.

FSM did not meet its FFY 2012 proficiency targets and demonstrated slippage for both Math and Reading from previous year's reporting. The proficiency performance for Math decreased from 1% in FFY 2011 to .9% in FFY 2012. For Reading, there was a decrease from 1.8% in FFY 2011 to 0% in FFY 2012.

To ensure that all students, including students with disabilities, participate in the assessment, the demographic information for all students was printed on the answer sheets prior to the administration of the test. The FSM NDOE also attempted to increase the number of participation for all students by funding for a ship to the remote islands of Pohnpei, Chuuk, and Yap. Also, staff from NDOE joined the states' assessment teams to the remote islands. However, the geographic isolation of the 54 different schools continued to be a major challenge. In addition, miscommunication and scheduling were issues that FSM continues to address to ensure that all students participate in the NMCT.

The Pacific Assessment Consortium (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 alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (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.

In July 2012, Guam CEDDERS, in partnership with the NCSC, facilitated follow-up training for the PAC6 Cadres. FSM participated in the follow-up training for Cadres 1 and 2 to provide training to further their roles as local technical support for improving academic instruction for students participating in the AA-AAS and implementing the NAAC-PAC6 Student/Program Observation Tools. FSM also participated in the regional training on "Communication Supports for Instruction and Assessment" to examine the implications on implementing a "Communication Triage" into the instruction and assessment of students with significant cognitive disabilities requiring an AA-AAS.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

In November 2012, Guam CEDDERS facilitated training for the FSM Cadre 2, focusing on the administration of the NAAC-PAC6 Observation Tools and the implementation of the Stepwise Process for improving academic instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities.

In December 2012, a team from the FSM, which included all four State Special Education Directors, participated in the PACIFIC Project Leadership Team meeting to review the FSM's project outcomes and identify next steps for continuing the PAC6 Journey in support of critical changes to curriculum, instruction, and assessment for student with significant cognitive disabilities requiring an AA-AAS.

During the week of February 25-March 1, 2013, the FSM participated in the "*Thinking Through Collaboration*" regional training facilitated by the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC), WRRRC, and Guam CEDDERS. This training provided a guide to increasing educational results for all children through communication, cooperation, coordination, and collaboration.

In June 2013, the NDOE facilitated a workshop on the scoring of student portfolio students requiring AA-AAS on Chuuk State for all Special Education assessment staff and some of the general education specialists and administrators from the FSM states. In addition, the participants also reviewed the assessment guidelines for determination of appropriate assessment types and accommodations.

The FSM continues to complete a Learner Characteristics Inventory (LCI) for each student identified to participate in the AA-AAS, and also continues to conduct student observations using the National Alternate Assessment Center (NAAC)-PAC6 Student/Program Observation Tools for improving academic instruction. Guam CEDDERS and edCount provide assistance to FSM NDOE with collecting, compiling, and analyzing the LCI data, providing recommendations for improvement.

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 2011 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).

'12-'13 Progress: Continuing Activity: July 2012 to June 2013, NDOE and SDSU facilitated four separate trainings on the revised FSM Special Education Procedural Manual on each of the FSM States. The trainings covered the IEP team's determination of appropriate assessment for each student, including students with severe cognitive disabilities who require AA-AAS.

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.

'12-'13 Progress: Continuing Activity: In June 2013, the NDOE facilitated a workshop on the scoring of student portfolio students requiring A-AAS on Chuuk State for all Special Education assessment staff and some of the general education specialists and administrators from the FSM states. In addition, the participants also reviewed the assessment guidelines for determination of

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

appropriate assessment types and accommodations.

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.

'12-'13 Progress: Continuing Activity: To ensure that every student is accounted for, all the names of students in the tested grades were printed on the answer sheets prior to the administration of the test.

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.

'12-'13 Progress: Continuing Activity: Refer to progress for Improvement Activities 1, 2, and 3.

Improvement Activity 5: 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.

'12-'13 Progress: Continuing Activity: With the first FSM Response to Intervention (RTI) workshop held in Chuuk State in April 2011 and the FSM Association of Chief State School Officers (FACSSO) endorsement of the RtI Initiative through Resolution 11-02, FSM continued to develop the RtI framework at both the National and State levels to ensure deliberate planning would result in effective implementation in the schools and classrooms.

SDSU assisted the FSM in developing its first RTI Handbook that aligns with the FSM Special Education Procedural Manual. Training on the new RTI Handbook was held in Yap State in July 2012 for teachers and administrators for both general and special education programs. The training modules were provided for each of the states. The FSM and SDSU facilitated trainings on the Special Education Procedural Manual for all special teachers and administrators in all the four states. The training was conducted for Chuuk and Pohnpei on June 17-22, 2013; and Kosrae and Yap on July 18-26, 2013. One of the focuses for the training was on developing education and related services that ensure student success.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines /Resources for 2013-2014:

As indicated on page 2 of this APR, although FFY 2012 represents the last reporting year of the FFY 2005-2012 SPP, FSM will continue to report on the status of each improvement activity, including the continuation, if appropriate, of the improvement activity in FFY 2013. FSM indicated the status of the improvement activities within the Discussion Section.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

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 |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 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 2012 APR, use data from 2011-2012). Therefore, for Indicator 4, the target and actual data for FFY 2012 will be the FFY 2011 data. |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 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 2012 (2012-2013): As per OSEP's instruction, Actual Target Data will be the actual data from FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

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 2012

As reported in FSM's IDEA 618 Table 5 for FFY 2011, FSM did not have any student with an IEP suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days in the school year.

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 2012 (2012-2013):

As per OSEP's instructions, for this APR, FSM reports FFY 2011 (2011-2012) data and compares it to FSM FFY 2011 (2011-2012) target.

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

OSEP Memorandum 14-2, October 2013

OSEP provided additional instructions in an effort to reduce reporting burden. For the FFY 2012 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 2011; 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 2012; and b) results indicators where the State has met its FFY 2012 target.

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 2013-2014:

As indicated on page 2 of this APR, although FFY 2012 represents the last reporting year of the FFY 2005-2012 SPP, FSM will continue to report on the status of each improvement activity, including the continuation, if appropriate, of the improvement activity in FFY 2013.

Status of Improvement Activities

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

Improvement Activity 2: System Category: Administration and Monitoring
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.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs serves inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilitates, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------------|--|
| 2012 (2012-2013) | <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 facilitates, or homebound/hospitals placements |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

FSM TREND DATA through FFY 2012: 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, 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% |
| December 1, 2012 | 1856 | 1750 | 94.2% | 32 | 1.7% | 71 | 3.8% |

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 2012

OSEP 618 LRE Environments Data by FSM LEAs for FFYs 2008-2012:

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, 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% |
| December 1, 2012 | 822 | 811 | 98.6% | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1.2% |

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, 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% |
| December 1, 2012 | 154 | 125 | 81% | 9 | 6% | 18 | 12% |

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, 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% |
| December 1, 2012 | 686 | 648 | 95% | 23 | 3% | 15 | 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, 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% |
| December 1, 2012 | 194 | 166 | 86% | 0 | 0 | 28 | 14% |

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

Measurement A: FSM did not meet its target of 97.1% and reported progress from 94% (1779/1901) in FFY 2011 to 94.2% (1750/1856) in FFY 2012.

Measurement B: FSM did not meet its target of .25% and reported progress from 2.5% (48/1901) in FFY 2011 to 1.7% (32/1856) in FFY 2012.

Measurement C: FSM did not meet its target of 1%, and reported slight slippage from 3.6% (68/1901) in FFY 2011 to 3.8% (71/1856) in FFY 2012.

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 94.2% in FFY 2012 compared to the U.S. National mean of 64% for FFY 2011, as reported in the 2013 Part B Summary Book, SPP/APR Indicator 5 Analysis completed by University of Kansas, July 2013. Further, of the reported FFY 2011 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 94.2% performance for FFY 2012.

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 continues to build a system of supports 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.

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 2011 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.

'12-'13 Progress: **Continuing Activity:** In FFY 2012, a new case manager report was added to the SITS, which contains the summary information of each student's record for each specific case manager. The report was designed for the case managers to review and update all their records, for special education coordinators to use for decision-making and management, and for program planning during weekly case management meetings. This mechanism

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

allowed for a closer and more consistent review of IEP students' performance and least restrictive learning environments most appropriate for each individual student.

In March 2013, NDOE and SDSU facilitated a data training was held in Pohnpei for all LEA special education data managers. During the training, there was a review of the SITS user's guide and the revised Special Education Procedural Manual, which contains the specific processes and timelines for data input into the SITS.

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.

'12-'13 Progress: Continuing Activity: FSM and SDSU facilitated trainings on the Special Education Procedural Manual for all special teachers, parents, and administrators in all the four states. The training was conducted for Chuuk and Pohnpei on June 17-22, 2013; and Kosrae and Yap on July 18-26, 2013. One of the focuses for the training was on developing education and related services that ensure student success.

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.

'12-'13 Progress: Continuing Activity: FSM continues to monitor the provisions of the LRE through onsite and offsite monitoring of the LEA programs and a review of the LRE data for Indicators 5 and 618 Table 3 in the SITS.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2013-2014:

As indicated on page 2 of this APR, although FFY 2012 represents the last reporting year of the FFY 2005-2012 SPP, FSM will continue to report on the status of each improvement activity, including the continuation, if appropriate, of the improvement activity in FFY 2013. FSM indicated the status of the improvement activities within the Discussion Section.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of children ages 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

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

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

Measurement:

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

Data Source:

Data collected under IDEA section 618.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2012 (2012-2013) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. 88.7% of the children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP attend a regular early childhood program and receive the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program B. .6% of the children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP attend separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

Table 1: Measurement A: Children ages 3 through 5 attending early childhood programs and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program.

| a. | b. | c. |
|--|---|---|
| Total # of Children 3 through 5 with an IEP | Children ages 3 through 5 with IEP's attending regular early childhood programs and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | % Attending Regular Early Childhood Programs (b/a)x100 |
| 127 | 102 | 102/127 x 100 80.3% |

Data Source: IDEA 618 Environments Data, December 1, 2012

Column (a) Is the total number of children ages 3 through 5 years old with an IEP as reported in the 618 Child Count on December 1, 2012.

Column (b) Is the number of children ages 3 through 5 with IEP's attending regular early childhood programs and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program.

Column (c) Is the percentage of children ages 3 through 5 attending regular early childhood programs.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Table 2: Measurement B: Children ages 3 through 5 attending separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

| a. | b. | c. |
|--|--|---|
| Total # of Children 3 through 5 with an IEP | Children ages 3 through 5 with IEP's attending separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | % Attending separate special education class, separate school or residential facility (b/a)x100 |
| 127 | 0 | 0/127 x 100 0% |

Data Source: IDEA 618 Environments Data, December 1, 2012

Column (a) Is the total number of children 3 through 5 years old with an IEP as reported in the 618 Child Count on December 1, 2012.

Column (b) Is the number of children 3 through 5 with IEP's attending separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

Column (c) Is the Percentage of children age 3 through 5 attending separate class or separate school or residential facility

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target that occurred for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

Measurement 6A: FSM did not meet the target of 88.7% reporting a performance of 80.3% for this measurement.

Measurement 6B: FSM met the target of .6% with a performance of 0% for this measure.

As indicated in Table 3, FSM has 127 children ages 3 through 5 with IEPs. **80.3%** of these children, which is 102 of 127, attended an early childhood education (ECE) program and received a majority of the special education and related services in the regular early childhood education program. The remaining 25 children ages 3 through 5 with IEPs not included in the table below received early childhood special education services at home or other community settings/environments.

Table 3: Preschool LRE for FFY 2012- 2013 by State

| State | FSM Total # children aged 3-5 with IEPs | Ages 3-5 | | | |
|--------------|--|--|--------------|--|------------|
| | | Measurement A Children ages 3 through 5 attending regular early childhood program and receiving majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program . | | Measurement B Children ages 3 through 5 attending separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | |
| | | # | % of Total | # | % of Total |
| Chuuk | 70 | 59 | 84% | 0 | 0% |
| Kosrae | 13 | 12 | 92% | 0 | 0% |
| Pohnpei | 34 | 27 | 79% | 0 | 0% |
| Yap | 10 | 4 | 40% | 0 | 0% |
| Total | 127 | 102 | 80.3% | 0 | 0% |

All four (4) LEAs have regular ECE centers that support preschoolers including preschoolers with disabilities in early childhood settings based on the individual need of the child. There are 101 regular ECE Centers throughout FSM with 46 ECE Centers in Chuuk, 6 in Kosrae, 23 in Pohnpei, and 26 ECE Centers in Yap State. The early childhood special education services are primarily provided at the child's home, ECE centers, or "Nahs" that are natural learning environments in the villages that provide many opportunities for preschoolers with disabilities to learn, grow, and play along their peers without disabilities.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Status of Improvement Activities

The following describes progress made on the implementation of improvement activities organized by improvement activity system categories. This APR represents the first performance reporting year for this Indicator:

Improvement Activity 1:

System Category: Collaboration and Coordination

In collaboration with NDOE, the National Department of Health (NDH) will co-sponsor the Inter-Agency Council conference. The purpose of the conference is to support the identification, referral, and services for young children with disabilities or other health conditions and their families.

'12-'13 Progress:

Continuing Activity: Monthly video conferencing continues to be held between service providers working with children with disabilities ages 3-5 from each State. The purpose of the network is to improve services by enhancing and strengthening the collaboration and unity among service providers for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers with special needs and their families. Members consist of representatives from all four FSM States. Since August 2011 the network has included representatives from Department of Health programs such as Maternal and Child Health (MCH) and Children with Special Health Needs (CSHN).

In August 2013, the National Department of Health and NDOE hosted a National Inter-Agency Council (NIAC) Conference. The theme was *"Count Us In: Promoting and Strengthening Interagency Collaboration and Empowering Persons with Disabilities in FSM."* As a result of the conference, representatives from each State provided input and revised the PRESIDENTIAL NATIONAL ADVISORY COORDINATING COUNCIL (PNACC) guidance and council membership composition. State delegation included representatives from State Departments of Health and Education, parent networks, and disabled people organizations.

In March and April 2013, Kosrae Health Services conducted dental workshop for all ECE parents on how to maintain healthy lifestyles and good hygiene at an early age. The training was a result of a collaborative effort between Kosrae Dental Division, Kosrae Department of Education (KDOE) Special Education, ECE, College of Micronesia - Land Grant, etc.

On February 6-17, 2013, Kosrae Child Find Committee consisting of COM-FSM Land Grant, Kosrae Women Association and other key staff conducted a child find survey to all parents of children from ages 0-5 in each community center.

In August 2012, Yap MCH and Special Education conducted a one-day workshop with ECE Teachers providing program updates and requirements. As a result, Yap MCH, ECE and Special Education programs reviewed their collective efforts and progress for continuous improvement purposes.

Improvement Activity 2:

System Category: TA/Training and Professional Development:

Provide training for early childhood teachers and related service providers on strategies that promote inclusive practices and evidence

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

based practices for young children with disabilities. Topics to include but not limited to: classroom management, effective instruction, ECE policies and procedures.

'12-'13 Progress:

Continuing Activity: In August 15, 2013, training on Strategies to Support the Growth & Development of Young Children from ages 0-5 was conducted by Dr. Linda Flynn-Wilson, Ph.D. in collaboration with National IAC and University of New Orleans. State representatives participated in the training which included RSAs, Program Monitor & Supports, Data Managers/Clerks, DOE Directors, ECE Teacher, Classroom Teachers, parents, MCH nurses, support staff, etc. There were 80 plus participants attended that training.

On August 17, 2013, Chuuk State presented Chuuk's Early Childhood Skills Measurement Tool during the NIAC 2013 Conference to RSAs, ECE teachers, and parents. Early Childhood Teachers and RSAs learned about how Chuuk ECE staff assess Chuuk ECE students in the 8 domains. Participants were given the opportunity to share their practices, which provided good information and learning for other states.

In June 2013, Kosrae Department of Education hosted an Educational Week entitled "Working Together For Better and Meaningful Results" a collaboration between Department of Health, Kosrae Island Resource Management Authority (KIRMA), Kosrae Conservation and Safety Organization (KCSO), DOE, and Kosrae Women Association (KWA). The Education Week was attended by all teachers, state leaders, and parents with trainings and workshops on various topics relating to early learning and development, early literacy, etc.

In June 2013, the Pohnpei State ECE RSA Special Education Specialist conducted training on the 4-Step Process for all regular and special education teachers, school principals, and 3rd year major college students from the College of Micronesia-FSM. A total of 15 ECE teachers were present at the training.

Pohnpei State conducts its annual Teacher Forum for all teachers in February of each year. February 18-20, 2013, Pohnpei State had another Teacher Forum providing trainings and workshops for ECE, General Education & Special Education teachers. Training on the Revised Special Education Procedural Manual and 4-step process was presented to all participants by Pohnpei Special Education staff.

In collaboration with Special Education, Yap ECE conducts annual orientation in September each year. In September 2013, this activity brought together parents of children ages 3-5 to provide awareness on topics relating to early childhood development, early learning & literacy, and the special education screening process for suspected children with special needs.

Improvement Activity #3:

System Category: TA/Training and Program Development

NDOE will collaborate with LEAs to facilitate the Related Service Assistants (RSA) training program with a focus on early childhood.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

'12-'13 Progress:

Continuing Activity: Chuuk State conducted annual pre-service training in early August 2013. Training was intended for ECE & General Education and Special Education teachers. Topic of discussion included instructional approaches, classroom management, assessment, classroom instruction, curriculum & instruction, etc.

During the NIAC Conference in August 2013, the following topical presentations were provided:

- Training on pre-referral strategies for young children with disabilities was conducted by Dr. Linda Flynn-Wilson from University of New Orleans. The presentation included information and strategies on working with children who are suspected of having a developmental delay when a diagnosis has not been made. Parents and service providers learned how working with families is a key component in ensuring that children's developmental needs are met.
- *Playing & Learning* was conducted by Vera Blaz, M.A., from Guam CEDDERS. The presentation taught participants the importance of playing being part of children's learning and development.
- Early Intervention Planning & Follow-Up training was conducted by Dr. Linda Flynn-Wilson from University of New Orleans. Participants included State School Directors, RSAs, Classroom Resource Teachers (CRT), Classroom Teachers, ECE Teachers, State Early Hearing Detection Intervention (EHDI)/ CSHN Coordinators, parents, IAC members, MCH Coordinators, ECE Education Specialists, DOE staff, etc. Forty-four plus participants from all four States attended the training.
- A session entitled: *Health Related Issues in Working with Families with Young Children with Disabilities* was conducted by FSM-CSHN Physician, Dr. Anamaria Yomai. Present in the session were representatives in different roles from all the States. There were health program coordinators, data clerks, program monitor & support, RSA's, parents, classroom resource teachers, and school health coordinators. The number of participants was 20 plus.

In May 2013, Tehkie Mahs (Child Find) training was conducted by Pohnpei State team to all Yap main island RSAs on how to carry out the Tehkie Mahs Fair. All Yap Main Island RSAs were trained one week before the Tehkie Mahs Fair, a one day activity. The Fair is a collective effort between Health & Special Education. For each screening booth an RSA from Yap is assigned to observe and later do hands-on practice as they are certified RSAs.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines /Resources for 2013-2014:

As indicated on page 2 of this APR, although FFY 2012 represents the last reporting year of the FFY 2005-2012 SPP, FSM will continue to report on the status of each improvement activity, including the continuation, if appropriate, of the improvement activity in FFY 2013. FSM indicated the status of the improvement activities within the Discussion Section.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

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 2012 (2012-2013):

Table 1: 2012-2013 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 2012 Target (% of children) | FFY 2012 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% | $\frac{(c+d)}{(a+b+c+d)} \times 100 = \%$ $\frac{(15+40)}{(0+6+15+40)} \times 100 =$ 90.2% |

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

| Measurable and Rigorous Target and Performance | | |
|---|--|---|
| SUMMARY STATEMENTS | | |
| Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships). | FFY 2012 Target (% of children) | FFY 2012 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% | $\frac{(d+e)}{(a+b+c+d+e)} \times 100 = \%$ $\frac{(40+4)}{(0+6+15+40+4)} \times 100 =$ $44/65 \times 100 =$ 68% |
| Outcome B: Acquisition & use of knowledge & skills (including early language/communication and early literacy). | FFY 2012 Target (% of children) | FFY 2012 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% | $\frac{(c+d)}{(a+b+c+d)} \times 100 = \%$ $\frac{(19+35)}{(0+7+19+35)} \times 100 =$ $54/61 \times 100 =$ 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% | $\frac{(d+e)}{(a+b+c+d+e)} \times 100 = \%$ $\frac{(35+4)}{(0+7+19+35+4)} \times 100 =$ $39/65 \times 100 =$ 60% |
| Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. | FFY 2012 Target (% of children) | FFY 2012 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% | $\frac{(c+d)}{(a+b+c+d)} \times 100 = \%$ $\frac{(14+40)}{(0+5+14+40)} \times 100 =$ $54/59 \times 100 =$ 92% |
| 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% | $\frac{(d+e)}{(a+b+c+d+e)} \times 100 = \%$ $\frac{(40+6)}{(0+5+14+40+6)} \times 100 =$ $46/65 \times 100 =$ 70.8% |

For this reporting period, there were 65 preschoolers with IEPs that had both entry and exit measures. Of the 65 preschoolers, there were 25 from Chuuk, 10 from Kosrae, 29 from Pohnpei, and 1 from Yap State.

As indicated in the table above, FSM met five (5) of the six outcome targets:

- Outcome A: **Positive Social Emotional Skills**
 - For Summary Statement (SS) 1, FSM reported **90.2%** of preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in social emotional skills, and who substantially increased in their rate of growth of social emotional skills. For this Outcome A measurement, FSM's performance was at 90.2%, exceeding the target of **79.7%** for this reporting period.
 - For Summary Statement 2, **68%** of preschoolers, 44 of 65, 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 **68%**.

- 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 who entered or exited the preschool program below expectations in acquiring and using knowledge and skills, and who substantially increased in their rate of growth. 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 2012

- For Summary Statement 2, **60%** 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 60% for this reporting period. This is also a slippage from 62% for FFY2011 to 60% in FFY 2012. Although FSM did not meet the target for this measure the performance is comparable to the National Data taken from Part B SPP/APR 2013 Summary Book, July 2013 reporting 53%.
- **Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:**
 - For Summary Statement 1, FSM reported **92%** of preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below expectations in using appropriate behaviors to meet their needs, and who substantially increased in their rate of growth. FSM's performance of 92% exceeded the target of **88%** for this reporting period.
 - For Summary Statement 2, **70.8%** of preschoolers were functioning within age expectations in the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs, by the time they exited. FSM met the target of **68.4%** with a performance of 70.8% meeting the target for this reporting period.

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

FSM met the five (5) of the six (6) targets for this indicator: Outcomes met were Outcome A, Summary Statement 1 and 2; Outcome B, Summary Statement 1; and Outcome C, Summary Statement 1 and 2 for this reporting period. FSM did not meet the target of 66% for Outcome B Summary Statement 2 with a slippage reporting at 60% (39/65). The reasons for the progress in the outcomes measures may be attributed to the increased understanding of the early childhood providers in all 4 States. Service providers are being more consistent and diligent in ensuring that all IEP students in early childhood learning centers are provided with appropriate instruction and are properly assessed using the Early Childhood Child Outcome Summary (COS).

The FSM continues to use the COS to report on a child's progress in the three outcome measures. A child who rates 6 or 7 is considered to be developing at age "comparable to age peers." The child's IEP Team, including the parent, 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, which was updated this past year 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 revised procedures and data collection protocols to ensure fidelity and validity of the data and improved results for preschoolers with disabilities.

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

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

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

| | Chuuk | | Kosrae | | Pohnpei | | Yap | | FSM | |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | # 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% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0% | 1 | 10% | 5 | 17% | 0 | 0% | 6 | 9% |
| c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach | 0 | 0% | 7 | 70% | 8 | 28% | 0 | 0% | 15 | 23% |
| d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 25 | 100% | 2 | 20% | 12 | 41% | 1 | 100% | 40 | 62% |
| e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 4 | 14% | 0 | 0% | 4 | 6% |
| 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% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0% | 2 | 20% | 5 | 17% | 0 | 0% | 7 | 11% |
| c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach | 0 | 0% | 6 | 60% | 13 | 45% | 0 | 22.2% | 19 | 29% |
| d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 25 | 100% | 2 | 20% | 8 | 28% | 0 | 11.1% | 35 | 54% |
| e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 3 | 10% | 1 | 33.3% | 4 | 6% |

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

| 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% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0% | 2 | 20% | 3 | 20% | 0 | 0% | 5 | 8% |
| c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach | 0 | 0% | 5 | 50% | 9 | 31% | 0 | 0% | 14 | 21.5% |
| d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 25 | 100% | 3 | 30% | 11 | 38% | 1 | 100% | 40 | 61.5% |
| e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 6 | 21% | 0 | 0% | 6 | 9% |

In comparing the FSM outcome performance data for this reporting period with the 2011 National Average that was taken from the OSEP Part B SPP/APR 2012 Indicator Analyses, August 2012 booklet, FSM performed above the national average in the following outcome measures:

- For Outcome A, Summary Statement 1, FSM reported 90% and the national average for 2010 was at 79%
- For Outcome A, Summary Statement 2, FSM performed 67% 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 2011 national average;
- For Outcome B, Summary Statement 2, FSM reported 60% and slightly higher than the national average data at 53%
- For Outcome C, Summary Statement 1, FSM reported 89%, significantly higher than the national average at 79%.
- For Outcome C, Summary Statement 2, FSM reported 71% and performed higher than the national average at 66%.

OSEP FFY 2011 APR Results Data Summary Notes, July 2013

REQUIRED ACTIONS: The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2012 in the FFY 2012 APR. **FSM Response:** Refer to the Actual Target and Discussion Sections of this Indicator.

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 2011 APR:

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.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

'12-'13 Progress:

Continuing Activity: In October 2012, Pohnpei State conducted a Parent Literacy Workshop island-wide for ECE parents and service providers regarding strategies for improving early childhood outcomes: (a) Positive social emotional skills; (b) Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills; and (c) Use of appropriate behavior. The Parent Literacy Workshop was held in each of the six (6) municipalities allowing all ECE parents from villages to attend.

In August 2013, a presentation entitled: "*How Can the Early Child Outcomes Help Parents Understand Children's Progress?*" was held during the annual NIAC Conference. This opportunity allowed parents and services providers, including Department of Health personnel, to engage in dialogues to share understanding, concerns, and practical strategies to foster positive child growth.

A 3-hour presentation was held during the NIAC Conference entitled: *Developing High Quality Functional IEP Goals*. Participants reviewed the outcome measures and the process for collecting and reporting the data with emphasis on how to develop functional learning goals for early childhood students with IEP.

Improvement Activity 2:

System Category: Policy and Procedures

Review and revise the procedures for collecting, reporting, and verifying the data.

'12-'13 Progress:

Continuing Activity: In August 2013, CEDDERS assisted FSM NDOE in the revision of the FSM ECO Measurement System Procedure, with all state represented, during the NIAC 2013 Conference.

In August 2012, Kosrae State conducted a data analysis workshop. The purpose of the workshop was to be able to read and understand data regarding functional skills, especially for children with disabilities served in the early childhood community centers.

In August 2013, a presentation was conducted by an Instructor from the College of Micronesia-FSM on the Electronic Grade Book as an Assessment Tool. The presenter shared an electronic grade book for recording grades on computers. Participants learned to generate assessment data and create charts, which can help track students' academic performance. Implications for use of the electronic grade book are currently being considered to support collection and analysis of ECO data.

Quarterly video conferencing session were held on the early childhood outcomes procedures for collecting, reporting, and verifying outcome data with representatives from each State with technical assistance and support from Guam CEDDERS. Individual LEA worked collaboratively with staff from the Early Childhood Education Program to ensure the completion of the Child Outcomes Summary Form 45 days after the completion of the initial IEP and prior to exiting the early childhood program.

Improvement Activity 3:

System Category: TA / Training / Professional Development

Train on strategies on topical areas that would enhance the overall development of young children with disabilities.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

'12-'13 Progress:

Continuing Activity: The 3rd FSM Early Hearing Detection and Intervention (EHDI) Symposium was held in Chuuk on August 3, 2012. The theme for the symposium was entitled "FSM-EHDI Collaboration & Partnership for Infants and Young Children with Hearing Loss & Their Families." Invited participants included State EHDI & Children with Special Health Needs (CSHN) Coordinators, Maternal and Child Health (MCH) Data Clerks, Physicians, RSA's and parents of children with a hearing loss.

In August 2013, Kosrae State conducted training on Kosrae's Special Education ECE Referral Process. Kosrae's Early Childhood Supervisor presented information on how Kosrae Special Education conducts the referral process from identification to exiting from the Special Education program. Participants discussed the referral process practiced in their own entities and learned from the dialoguing.

In August 2013, training on integrating the Early Childhood Outcomes into the IEP Process was conducted by Ms. Elaine Eclavea, Guam CEDDERS. The training provided good information to all RSAs and ECE teachers working with children with disabilities and their families.

During the NIAC Conference held in August 2013, the following topical presentations were provided:

- Playing & Learning was conducted by Vera Blaz, M.ED. Guam CEDDERS. The presentation taught participants the importance of play as part of children's learning.
- Early Intervention Planning & Follow-Up training was conducted by Dr. Linda Wilson-Flynn from the University of New Orleans. Participants included State School Directors, RSAs, Classroom Resource Teachers (CRT), Classroom Teachers, ECE Teachers, State Early Hearing Detection Intervention (EHDI)/ CSHN Coordinators, parents, IAC members, MCH Coordinators, ECE Education Specialists, DOE staff, etc. Approximately forty-four participants from all four States attended the training.
- A session on health related issues in working with families with young children with disabilities was conducted by FSM-CSHN Physician, Dr. Anamaria Yomai. Present in the session were representatives in different roles from all the States. There were health program coordinators, data clerks, program monitor & support, RSA's, parents, classroom resource teachers, and school health coordinators.

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.

'12-'13 Progress:

Continuing Activity: Kosrae State conducted Parent & Teacher Training at the end of each quarter regarding academic issues. Some topics of discussion during the training are academic, functional level, behavior, attendance etc. The purpose is to improve student performance. (Sept. 2012, Dec. 2012, March 2013, May 2013)

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

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.

'12-'13 Progress: Continuing Activity: In October 2012, Pohnpei State conducted a Parent Literacy Workshop island-wide for ECE parents and service providers regarding strategies for improving student performance, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, use of appropriate behavior, positive social emotional skills, parental involvement, etc. The Workshop was conducted in each Municipality allowing all ECE parents from neighboring villages to attend.

In August 2013, Training on Language and Communication and the importance of language from birth was conducted by Ms. Vera Blaz, Guam CEDDERS. Participants included RSAs, ECE Teachers, parents, etc.

LEAs continue to collaborate with ECE Programs in conducting annual ECE trainings focusing on social emotional development, approaches to learning and other topical areas.

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.

'12-'13 Progress: Continuing Activity: In April 2013, Pohnpei State conducted the revised survey to parents during a parent training on the complaint process and parents rights, which was also translated into Pohnpeian. The activity was held throughout the islands including Pohnpei Main Island at 5 sites including all of its outer islands. 194 Pohnpeian parents who took the survey participated in the Complaint Process Training as well.

Annually, in Chuuk State, public awareness meetings held during disability day are supported through the use of posters, banners, pamphlets, fact sheets, etc. Other than the support and participation of special education staff and parents, the community is just as involved as well.

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.

'12-'13 Progress: Continuing Activity: As part of the 3rd FSM Early Hearing Detection Intervention (EHDI) Symposium, each FSM State must develop one brochure for their EHDI program and share their production with the symposium participants. This involves information on the types of available services provided by both Departments of Health and Education.

FSM continues to show positive results on the early childhood outcomes as reported annually on the FSM special education website including reports on early childhood and related trainings.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

FSM States with Radio Stations provide program scheduled updates on-air and live when necessary.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines /Resources for 2013-2014:

As indicated on page 2 of this APR, although FFY 2012 represents the last reporting year of the FFY 2005-2012 SPP, FSM will continue to report on the status of each improvement activity, including the continuation, if appropriate, of the improvement activity in FFY 2013. FSM indicated the status of the improvement activities within the Discussion Section.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

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 |
|----------------------------|--|
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 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 2012 (2012-2013):

For FFY 2012, FSM reports that of the 2037 students with IEPs ages 3-21, **1759 or 86%** 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 2012

| State | # Students w/IEPs | # Respondents | % Respondents |
|--------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Chuuk | 907 | 907 | 100% |
| Kosrae | 185 | 182 | 98% |
| Pohnpei | 720 | 445 | 62% |
| Yap | 225 | 225 | 100% |
| Total | 2037 | 1759 | (1759/2037) = 86% |

FSM's FFY 2012 response rate of 86% (1759/2037) is comparable to the number of surveys received in the last reporting period. The number of 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 two of the 4 LEAs returning 100% of the surveys. FSM, therefore, demonstrates geographic, ethnic, and racial representation in the respondents for its FFY 2012 parent survey.

Data Collection Methods: Two of the four LEAs (Yap and Kosrae) worked closely with Advisory Council members and representatives of their parent organizations to support the dissemination and completion of the parent surveys. Both Yap and Kosrae trained parents in collaboration with the special education staff on the survey. As a result, Kosrae demonstrated an increase in its return rate and Yap maintained its 100% return rate. Kosrae increased their return rate from 95% in FFY 2011 to 98% in FFY 2012, an increase of 3%. The other two LEAs (Chuuk and Pohnpei) worked directly with the school principals and teachers in the dissemination and collection of the parent surveys. Parents were called to meeting sites where the surveys are administered. Parents were given the option of having the survey in their native language or in English or to have the survey read to them in their vernacular to increase their understanding of the survey questions being asked of them by the special education staff, a school principal or an advisory parent member. The strategies used by each LEA were found to be successful,

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

resulting in a significantly high return rate of parent surveys and demonstrating their commitment to ensuring all parents had an opportunity to provide input by completing the surveys.

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

The survey items provide three categories for families to respond to - 1) satisfied / understood / included; 2) somewhat; and 3) not enough. The total responses for each survey item, questions 1 through 6, are calculated based on the total response for each category divided by the total 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. In particular, 63% (6617/10553) of the responses indicated “satisfy/ understood/included” for this indicator measurement.

Table 2: Percent of Parent Response by Categories for FFY 2012

| STATE/LEA | TOTAL # RESPONSES | SATISFY / UNDERSTOOD / INCLUDED | SOMEWHAT | NOT ENOUGH |
|--------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| CHUUK | 5442 | 67% (3659/5442) | 26% (1437/5442) | 6% (249/5442) |
| KOSRAE | 1089 | 68% (743/1089) | 29% (312/1089) | 3% (34/1089) |
| POHNPEI | 2672 | 55% (1470/2672) | 29% (775/2672) | 16% (427/2672) |
| YAP | 1350 | 55% (745/1350) | 33% (443/1350) | 12.8% (162/1350) |
| TOTAL | 10553 | 63% 6617/10553 | 28% 2967/10553 | 8% 872/10553 |

The results of community awareness activities within the LEAs continue to demonstrate that parents are more aware of their role in their children’s services and feel that they are a full partner in making decisions about their children’s special education program. The 8% (872/10553) response for the rating of “not enough” in Table 2 represents a decrease in this category response from last year’s “not enough” rating of 11% (1188/10650). This 3% decrease in the “not enough” rating from last year is an indication that fewer parents feel they do not receive enough information to be full partners in making decisions about their children’s special education programs, which can be interpreted as more parents are aware of their role in their children’s services.

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

FSM did not meet its FFY 2012 target of 95%. FSM’s actual data showed 63% (6617/10553) of the responses indicated that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. This represents progress from previous year’s reporting by 7% from 56% (5993/10650) in FFY 2011 to 63% (6617/10553) for this reporting period. The reason for the increase in percentage may be attributed to the continued high response rate of the completed surveys of 86% (1759/2037) for this reporting year. FSM’s commitment to parent trainings and efforts to reach out to parents to share their perspectives has resulted in the significantly high percentage in survey return rate.

In August 11, 2011, 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 four parents to the conference with one of the parents conducting a presentation entitled: “*Mediation and Due Process*”. Six parents from Chuuk State attended; and three parents from Pohnpei State attended as well. During the preconference, two 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. Since this 2011 conference, state-level parent and community sessions have occurred in FFY 2012 in each LEA and parent representatives from all LEAs attended the 2013 NIAC Conference held in Pohnpei. For

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

further discussions of these activities, refer to the progress descriptions below in the Status of Improvement Activities.

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 2011 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.

'12-'13 Progress:

Continuing Activity: FSM values parents' rights and privacy. Therefore, LEAs assigned and trained parents, Advisory Council members, and special education staffs to administer parent surveys. Training on parent survey questions are held annually for Yap State beginning February or March of each year by the Parent Liaison before the administration of the survey in April. For Pohnpei State, the administration of the survey is conducted by representatives from parent organizations to avoid the tendency of respondents answering to please the surveyor. Pohnpei State continues the practice of collecting surveys as before, by inviting parents to attend a meeting and having other parents available to assist parents in filling out surveys. Kosrae and Chuuk State continue to train special education staff and visit homes of parents of children with disabilities to obtain their input to be used for program improvement. FSM NDOE continually supports all LEAs in parent trainings/workshops, forums, and conferences, etc.

Each LEA continues to hold focus group meetings annually 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.

All four LEAs continue to refine the method of disseminating and collecting the information by training special education staff on the survey and either requesting the parents to come to the school to complete the survey or the special education staff going to the home to interview the family.

All LEAs continue to use the translated survey in the different native languages. In addition, language interpreters/translators were made 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.

'12-'13 Progress:

Continuing Activity: FSM ensures the FSM Parent Survey for SY '12-'13 is administered by all LEAs no later than end of May each year:

Pohnpei State administered the parent survey during the last week of April 2013. The administration of the survey was carried out during trainings on complaint process, parents' rights, and Part B application public hearing for

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

parents and the public. The survey was conducted at five selected sites including the southern outlying islands. As for the eastern outlying islands, the administration of the survey was done at the earliest ship trip out to the eastern region. All parents of children with disabilities attending the trainings participated in the survey. Likewise in Yap State, administration of the parent survey was held as early as February when the FSM ship was scheduled to the neighboring islands.

Both Kosrae and Chuuk Special Education Programs staff administered the outcome survey at the homes of children with disabilities receiving services and schools in the municipalities. Program staffs were transported to administer the survey with the exception of several remote areas, which required traveling by boat and walking on foot from house to house.

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.

'12-'13 Progress:

Continuing Activity: FSM intends to achieve greater understanding of parents' perceptions using a variety of methods for gathering input. Both Pohnpei and Yap State provide annual trainings for parents and Advisory Council members conducting the survey. This method provides parents with a trustworthy environment that instigates openness when taking the survey. Kosrae and Chuuk State use program staff in administering the survey. FSM NDOE continually facilitates LEAs in seeking ways to gather parent input for program improvement purposes.

FSM continues to provide activities such as parent forums and parent focus conferences to increase parental awareness. FSM LEAs continually provide parent trainings on early intervention services, early childhood outcomes, complaint process procedures, and parents' rights, etc. Kosrae State conducted 21st Century Parenting Workshop in collaboration with PREL with an emphasis on improving parental involvement. Pohnpei State conducted a Parent Literacy Workshop in October 2012 island-wide for all ECE parents and service providers on strategies in improving student outcomes, early literacy and other related topics.

The administration of the survey is done by parents allowing a comforting environment which brings about confidence and openness when taking the survey.

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.

'12-'13 Progress:

Continuing Activity: FSM continues to seek various ways in promoting partnerships between schools and families to improve services and results for children with disabilities in the LEAs by supporting and encouraging parental participation in workshops/trainings, forums, and conferences locally, statewide, or nationally when necessary. For example, FSM NDOE funded LEA parent representatives and special education key staffs to the

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

2013 NIAC Conference in August 2013. Through parent panel discussions, LEA key staff members and FSM NDOE were informed of the successes and challenges from parents. This is important in the planning for continuous improvement in the services for children with disabilities and their families in the FSM.

NDOE held a 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 revised fiscal management procedures. Participants attending the public hearing included LEA key staffs, school principals, general education teachers (from early childhood education, elementary, high schools), parents of children with disabilities, and stakeholders.

FSM NDOE conducted a Parent-Consumer Conference in Yap from August 24-26, 2011. The theme entitled "Provide Equal Rights and Educational Opportunities for All." The purpose was to continuously seek ways to increase parental and community involvement in improving educational services to all children and young adults with disabilities. Invited participants included education key staff members, parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, and stakeholders.

In April 22-26, 2013, Pohnpei State held a parent training on the complaint process and Parent Rights at 3 different sites.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines /Resources for 2013-2014:

As indicated on page 2 of this APR, although FFY 2012 represents the last reporting year of the FFY 2005-2012 SPP, FSM will continue to report on the status of each improvement activity, including the continuation, if appropriate, of the improvement activity in FFY 2013. FSM indicated the status of the improvement activities within the Discussion Section.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

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 |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 100% of children with parental consent received for initial evaluation will be evaluated within 60 days. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

Following the measurement requirement for this indicator, the following Table shows data collected from each LEA for reporting period July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013:

| 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 | 385 | 385 | 100% |
| Kosrae | 44 | 44 | 100% |
| Pohnpei | 102 | 102 | 100% |
| Yap | 101 | 101 | 100% |
| FSM Total | 632 | 632 | 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, 2012 to June 30, 2013.

There were 632 parental consents for initial evaluation received for this reporting period. Of the 632 parental consents for initial evaluation, 100% (632/632) 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 2012 (2012-2013):

FSM demonstrated 100% (632/632) compliance in FFY 2012 for Indicator 11, maintaining 100% compliance as in the previous year.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

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 |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 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 2012 (2012-2013):

Following the measurement requirement for this indicator, the Table below displays data collected from each LEA for reporting period July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013:

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 | 102 | 102 | 100% |
| Kosrae | 27 | 27 | 100% |
| Pohnpei | 142 | 142 | 100% |
| Yap | 45 | 45 | 100% |
| TOTAL | 316 | 316 | 316/316 = 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, 2012 to June 30, 2013.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

FSM demonstrated 100% (316/316) compliance in FFY 2012 for Indicator 13, maintaining 100% compliance as in the previous year.

OSEP Memorandum 14-2, October 2013

OSEP provided additional instructions in an effort to reduce reporting burden. For the FFY 2012 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 2011; 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 2012; and b) results indicators where the State has met its FFY 2012 target.

For Indicator 13, 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 2013-2014: This is a compliance indicator therefore targets will not be adjusted.

As indicated on page 2 of this APR, although FFY 2012 represents the last reporting year of the FFY 2005-2012 SPP, FSM will continue to report on the status of each improvement activity, including the continuation, if appropriate, of the improvement activity in FFY 2013.

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: Completed.

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.

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: Completed.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

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 |
|----------------------------|--|
| 2012 (2012-2013) | <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 2012 (2012-2013):

Based on the IDEA 618 Table 4 Exit Data submitted for FFY 2011, FSM reported 118 youth with IEPs left high school: 84 graduated with a high school diploma, 33 dropped out, and 1 reached maximum age. These 118 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 118 leavers in FFY 2011. As shown, 94% (111/118) of the FFY 2011 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 2012

Table 1: Percentage of FFY 2011 Leavers Who were Respondents for 2012-2013 Survey

| LEA | (a) # of Leavers (Based on the FFY 2011 618 Table 4) | (b) # of Leavers Who Responded to the One-Year Follow-Up | (c) % Respondents (b) divided by (a) times 100 |
|------------------------|---|---|---|
| Chuuk | 40 | 33 | 33/40 x 100 = 83% |
| Kosrae | 12 | 12 | 12/12 x 100 = 100% |
| Pohnpei | 34 | 34 | 34/34 x 100 = 100% |
| Yap | 32 | 32 | 32/32x 100 = 100% |
| FSM Return Rate | 118 | 111 | 94% (111/118) |

Data Source: The leavers' data were taken from FSM's 618 Table 4 "exit" data reported for FFY 2011 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).

Data Collection Methods: FSM SEA and LEAs continue to monitor the implementation of the secondary transition policies and procedures including when and how the post school outcome surveys are completed. Each LEA gathers post-school outcome data annually between April and September for all youth with IEPs who received special education services and who graduated with a regular high school diploma, dropped out, withdrew or reached maximum age during the previous school year. The collection and compilation of the post-school outcome data are inputted into the SITS database to document and track students who exited the program in the previous school year that are surveyed and reported in this APR. Data are reviewed by the data managers at each LEA to ensure the data are accurate prior to inputting into the SITS database.

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

- 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.
- 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.
- 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).
- 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.).
- 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.
- Respondents are youth or their designated family member who answer the survey or interview questions.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Table 2: 2012-2013 Number of Respondents - 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 | 33 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 29 |
| Kosrae | 12 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| Pohnpei | 34 | 5 | 3 | 16 | 10 | 0 |
| Yap | 32 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 111 | 19 | 10 | 16 | 33 | 33 |

Table 3: 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 |
| 2012-2013 | 111 | $19/111 \times 100 =$ 17% | $(19 + 10)/111 \times 100 =$ 26% | $(19+10+16+33)/111 \times$ $100 =$ 70% |

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target that occurred for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

Measurement A: FSM exceeded the target of 14% for this measurement with a performance of **17%** or 19 out of 111 youth with IEPs enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school. Although, FSM met the target for this measurement, this indicates a drop of 9% percentage from the previous year which was 26% or 14 out of 54 youths.

Measurement B: FSM did not meet the target of 27% for this measurement with a performance of **26%**, or 29 out of 111 youth with IEPs in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. This is a slippage of 10% from FFY 2011-2012 reporting 37% (20/54).

Measurement C: FSM exceeded the target of 35% for this reporting period with a performance of **70%** or 78 out of 111 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 a progress from last year's performance of 54% or 29 out of 54 youths.

As shown in Table 4, further analysis revealed that the actual number of youths in Measurement A, B, and C increased from last reporting period. The reasons for the increase in the actual number of youths 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 may be attributed to the assignment of a secondary transition specialist or teacher for each student to discuss and monitor each student's progress on a quarterly basis.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Table 4: Actual Number of Youths in Measurement A, B, C for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012

| Indicator 14 | FFY 2011-2012 | FFY 2012- 2013 |
|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Measurement A | 14 | 19 |
| Measurement B | 20 | 29 |
| Measurement C | 29 | 78 |

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 2011 APR:

Improvement Activity 1:

System Category: Administration and Monitoring

FSM NDOE will facilitate a working group to gather input to expand the post school outcome survey.

'12-'13 Progress:

Continuing Activity: SEA continues to provide technical assistance and support to FSM LEAs to coordinate implementation of Indicator 13 activities that directly impact the outcome of post school outcome survey. Expansion of the survey resulted in a simplified version that was also translated into the vernacular for Pohnpei state. Chuuk, Yap and Kosrae conducted the survey also in their respective vernacular for parents requiring translation of the simplified survey.

FSM LEAs continue to include review of student IEPs and Transition plans and the status of exited students during their bi-weekly and monthly Case Managers meetings. In Yap, for instance, bi-weekly meeting were held to provide updates on the status of high school students and to review their IEP and Individualized Transition plan.

Improvement Activity 2:

System Category: TA/Training /Professional Development

Provide training on the revised survey and other related guidelines to special education coordinators and staff.

'12-'13 Progress:

Continuing Activity: Training was held for all junior and senior students at the Kosrae High School on different jobs and careers. Thirteen (13) students were then placed at the different departments/ agencies as well as private business as part of work experience activity.

Improvement Activity 3:

System Category: Administration and Monitoring

Training on revised secondary transition procedures and process for data collection and reporting. (Same as improvement activities in Indicators 13.2)

'12-'13 Progress:

Continuing Activity: In February 2013, Pohnpei and Chuuk Special Education Program conducted training on secondary transition procedures. This opportunity allowed both LEAs to review procedures and make recommendations to the component or section of the manual that would require modification based on LEAs' respective implementation of the procedures.

In August 2013, a presentation of the Secondary Transition requirements and process was facilitated during the FSM National Interagency Conference held on Pohnpei State. The session was attended by participants from all LEAs. This is another opportunity to review and

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

gather input on the procedures and how it can be revised and updated to meet LEAs' implementation needs while addressing other IDEA requirements not previously included in the manual.

Improvement Activity 4: System Category: Increasing/Adjusting FTE.
FSM NDOE will hire a National Secondary Transition Coordinator.

'12-'13 Progress: Continuing Activity: In December 2013, two teachers graduated with master and bachelor degrees from Pohnpei state. These graduates continue to work in the area of Secondary Transition at one high school in Pohnpei state.

FSM NDOE shifted its focus from hiring a National Secondary Transition Coordinator to expanding technical assistance and support to LEAs in the implementation of this Indicator requirement. Responsibilities under this proposed position are assigned to an existing employee at the FSM NDOE.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2013-2014:

As indicated on page 2 of this APR, although FFY 2012 represents the last reporting year of the FFY 2005-2012 SPP, FSM will continue to report on the status of each improvement activity, including the continuation, if appropriate, of the improvement activity in FFY 2013. FSM indicated the status of the improvement activities within the Discussion Section.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

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 |
|----------------------------|--|
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 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 2012 (2012-2013):

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 2011.

PART B INDICATOR 15 WORKSHEET

| Indicator/Indicator Clusters | General Supervision System Components | # of LEA Issued Findings in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12) | (a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12) | (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 2012

| Indicator/Indicator Clusters | General Supervision System Components | # of LEA Issued Findings in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12) | (a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 to 6/30/12) | (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 | 4 | 101 | 101 |
| | 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: • Case Review Management • Data Management/System • Fiscal Management • Interagency Agreement | Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 3 | 5 | 5 |
| Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b | | | 106 | 106 |
| 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 2012

Process for Monitoring:

In FFY 2011, 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 for all 4 LEAs: Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap, which resulted in findings of noncompliance.

In addition, NDOE conducts two off-site reviews annually, January and July, to assess LEA performance and progress in correction of findings of noncompliance, quarterly progress reports, audit/fiscal, SITS, LPP and Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE). Off-site reviews of performance are conducted for the general supervision purposes of: 1) monitoring appropriate implementation of services at the local level, 2) monitoring and supporting LEA in correction of identified non-compliance, and 3) issuing determination of LEA performance in implementing requirements of IDEA. In FFY 2011, two off-site reviews were conducted in January and the other in July. NDOE did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

As reported in the FFY 2011 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 2011 IDEA 618 Table 7.

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

In FFY 2012, FSM demonstrated 100% (106/106) compliance with Indicator 15, as shown in the B15 Worksheet. The breakdowns of verified timely correction were as follows:

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Timely Corrected (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

| | |
|---|------------|
| 1. Number of findings of noncompliance FSM made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator B15 Worksheet) | 106 |
| 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) | 106 |
| 3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)] | 0 |

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

| | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Number of FFY 2011 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 106 FFY 2011 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.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

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:

Indicator 5: Four LEAs issued a total of 101 findings of noncompliance

In FFY 2011, a total of 101 findings of noncompliance related to IEPs were issued to Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap. Chuuk was issued 15 findings, Kosrae 12 findings, Pohnpei 22 findings, and Yap received 52 findings of noncompliance. The findings of noncompliance were based on individual IEP file reviews and verification of service delivery during each LEA's on-site monitoring visit:

- Chuuk: Five findings were related to the delivery of special education services consistent with the IEP and 10 findings were related to the IEP content, including evidence of documented present level of performance, goals, and services.
- Kosrae: Five findings of noncompliance were related to the delivery of special education services not consistent with the IEP and seven findings of noncompliance were related to the IEP content, including documentation of clear descriptions for "frequency, duration, and location" of services to be provided.
- Pohnpei: Four findings were on special education services not consistent with the IEP and 18 findings of noncompliance related to deficiencies found in student records, such as missing documents and dates.
- Yap: Fifty-Two findings of noncompliance related to the delivery of special education services not consistent with the IEP.

Actions Taken to Verify Correction

NDOE verified timely correction of the 101 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 4 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 Chuuk to verify the timely correction of the findings of noncompliance. A review of the IEP files confirmed that the individual instances were corrected and the reviews of subsequent IEPs confirmed that the LEAs were implementing the regulatory requirements correctly. Verification of the consistency in the delivery of special education services based on the IEP was conducted through a review of the IEPs and written service delivery logs. FSM verified that all 101 findings were timely corrected.

Other: Three LEAs issued a total of 5 findings of noncompliance

In FFY 2011, Chuuk, Kosrae, and Pohnpei were issued findings of noncompliance related to system issues/noncompliance in the areas of case review management, data management/system, fiscal management and interagency agreement. Chuuk received 2 findings related to fiscal management and interagency agreement. Kosrae received 2 findings related to fiscal management and case/data management. Pohnpei received 1 finding related to fiscal management.

Actions Taken to Verify Correction

FSM verified timely correction of the 5 system findings issued to Chuuk, Kosrae, and Pohnpei, through a review of documentation provided by the LEAs to address the system issues identified in their corrective action plans. More detailed descriptions of the findings by LEA and verification of correction are as follows:

- Chuuk: Two system findings were issued related to the physical location of an inventory item and the interagency agreement in effect. As part of the fiscal management monitoring protocol, fixed assets are randomly selected to determine compliance with procurement process, as well as

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

physical location and assigned personnel for the fixed assets. In Chuuk, one of the fixed assets was not in the office at the time of the on-site visit. Evidence was provided within the month of the on-site visit verifying correction that the inventoried item was accounted for in the office. The other system finding was evidence of the interagency agreement in effect. A copy of the revised interagency agreement signed by the required agencies was provided to FSM NDOE as part of Chuuk's verified correction.

- **Kosrae:** Two system findings were issued related to procurement and IEP records inputted into the FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS) database. As part of the fiscal monitoring protocol, randomly selected procurement transactions were reviewed to ensure compliance with procurement regulations and requirements. As a result of this random review, one of the procured item reviewed did not have on file the required documentations for quotations, for purposes of price competition. Evidence of compliance with the procurement regulations (quotation copies) were provided to FSM NDOE for verified correction. The other finding was related to the procedures for verifying validity of student data inputted in the SITS database. Kosrae's written procedures were revised to include additional steps to ensure thorough case management reviews and accuracy of student data input into the SITS database. Revised procedures were provided to FSM NDOE to verify correction. Evidence of consistent student IEP updates into the SITS ensures IEP data retrieved from the SITS reflect current and accurate student data.
- **Pohnpei:** One system finding was issued related to fiscal management based on the protocol established for assessing the consistency of personnel actions with payroll records. Evidence of the corrected payroll record in question was provided to FSM NDOE for verified correction. There was no question costs related to this apparent clerical error. In addition, FSM NDOE required evidence that the assigned accountant for special education reviews the accuracy of personnel actions and payroll records for verified correction of the one system finding. Documentation of the accountant assignment and review procedures were provided to FSM NDOE.

OSEP FFY 2011 APR Response Table, July 2013

| Required Actions | FSM's Response |
|---|---|
| When reporting in the FFY 2012 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data 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 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. | 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, case review management, data system management, fiscal management, and interagency agreement. As described within Indicator 15, FSM provided the specific actions taken to verify correction for both the individual child-specific noncompliance findings and system noncompliance findings. |
| In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2012 APR, the State must use and submit the the Indicator 15 Worksheet. | FSM used the Indicator 15 Worksheet to determine the Actual Target for this Indicator. Refer to the Actual Target section of this Indicator. |

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

OSEP Memorandum 14-2, October 2013

OSEP provided additional instructions in an effort to reduce reporting burden. For the FFY 2012 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 2011; 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 2012; and b) results indicators where the State has met its FFY 2012 target.

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 2013-2014: This is a compliance target therefore targets will not be adjusted.

As indicated on page 2 of this APR, although FFY 2012 represents the last reporting year of the FFY 2005-2012 SPP, FSM will continue to report on the status of each improvement activity, including the continuation, if appropriate, of the improvement activity in FFY 2013.

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 Activity.

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 Activity.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

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

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2012 (2012-2013) | Targets will be set once required baseline data available (10 or greater). |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

FSM did not receive hearing requests in 2012-2013, as reflected in FSM's IDEA 618 Table 7.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to page 1 of this APR for development description.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

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

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2012 (2012-2013) | Targets will be set once required baseline data available (10 or greater). |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

FSM did not receive requests for hearings or mediations in 2012-2013, as reflected in FSM's IDEA 618 Table 7.

FSM Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2012

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 |
|----------------------------|---|
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 100% FSM reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. |

Actual Target Data for FFY 2012 (2012-2013):

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 November 2013 TA call, states/entities will have an opportunity to respond to OSEP's Indicator 20 calculation during "clarification" period anticipated in April/May 2014.