

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The Federated States of Micronesia, Department of Health, Education, and Social Affairs (FSM-HESA) 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). FSM-HESA facilitated the development of the 2005-2006 FSM Annual Performance Report (APR) through verification of each LEA's Local Performance Plan (LPP). The LPP is a component of each LEA's application for Part B funding under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) and is aligned with the FSM State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator measurement requirements. The first LPP developed at each LEA was for 2005-2006, as described in the FSM Continuous Improvement Monitoring System procedures revised in July 2006.

FSM-HESA engaged in the review of progress and slippage of each LEA's performance on FSM's Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) targets for 2005-2006 with the FSM National Steering/SPP Committee. The purpose for the review was to gather recommendations for possible revisions to targets and improvement activities. The following sessions were held:

- September 13-15, 2006: The FSM National Steering/SPP Committee met to review 2005-2006 progress data from each LEA. A review of the SPP/APR requirements with a copy of the OSEP SPP Letter, dated March 20, 2006, was conducted with an orientation session on the July 2006 revised procedures for the monitoring system that incorporated the SPP requirements into the quarterly and annual LEA reporting requirements, the Local Performance Plan (LPP). As a result, agreement was reached for each LEA to verify the data provided for final compilation and analysis of progress data for each SPP/APR Indicator.
- January 15 & 16, 2007: The FSM National Steering/SPP Committee met to review compiled data from each LEA for the SPP/APR reporting requirements. In particular, input was obtained for establishing targets and improvement activities for Indicator #8, Parent Involvement, one of the new SPP indicators (refer to updated SPP submitted on February 1, 2007).

PUBLIC DISSEMINATION PLAN

As required, FSM-HESA will report annually to the public on the progress and/or slippage in meeting the 'measurable and rigorous targets' found in the SPP, which would include the performance on the targets in the SPP. For the 2005-2006 APR, the FSM-HESA will implement the following public dissemination:

1. By February 9, 2007, upon submission of the FSM IDEA Part B Annual Performance Report to the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs, FSM-HESA will post the report on the FSM National Government Website: <http://www.fsmpio.fm/departments.htm> (select "Department of Health, Education, and Social Affairs (HESA)"). The FSM-HESA Secretary will distribute a memorandum to the President of FSM, Secretaries of other National Government agencies, and FSM-HESA Deputy Secretary and Assistant Secretaries for Health and Education notifying them of the posting.
2. By March 9, 2007, FSM-HESA will post a summary report of progress and/or slippage in meeting the 'measurable and rigorous targets' found in the SPP, which would include the overall FSM National and each LEA's 2005-2006 performance on the targets for the required SPP Indicators: 1, 2, 3, 4a, 5, and 6 on the FSM National Government Website: <http://www.fsmpio.fm/departments.htm> (select "Department of Health, Education, and Social Affairs (HESA)").
3. By March 15, 2007, a letter from the FSM-HESA Secretary to parents of children and youth with disabilities will be distributed via the Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Education and Special Education Program regarding the availability of the summary report on the website. The letter will also indicate the availability of a copy of the summary report at the LEAs upon request.
4. By March 15, 2007, FSM-HESA will facilitate, through the LEAs, local radio announcements regarding the availability of the summary report posted on the FSM website.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to overview provided on page 1.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	74% of youth with IEPs will have graduated from high school with a regular diploma, which represents working towards being comparable to the percent of all youth graduating with a regular diploma.

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

For the 2005-2006 reporting period, FSM's percentage of youth with IEPs graduating with a diploma was 83% (30/36), compared to all youth graduating with a diploma at 96% (1214/1269). The senior enrollment method for calculating the percentage was used for graduates without IEPs, graduates with IEPs, and a combination of graduates without IEPs and with IEPs for all seniors.

2005-2006 School Year	# & % Graduates with a Diploma in FSM		
	#Seniors	#Graduates	%Graduated
Seniors without IEPs	1233	1184	96%
Seniors with IEPs	36	30	83%
All Seniors	1269	1214	96%

Actual data by FSM States, Local Education Agencies (LEAs), for 2004-2005 & 2005-2006:

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

CHUUK:

CHUUK State LEA	# & % Graduates with a Diploma in Chuuk					
	2004-2005			2005-2006		
	#Seniors	#Graduates	%Graduated	#Seniors	#Graduates	%Graduated
Seniors without IEPs	540	467	86%	347	330	95%
Seniors with IEPs	8	4	50%	4	4	100%
All Seniors	548	471	86%	351	334	95%

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

KOSRAE:

KOSRAE State LEA	# & % Graduates with a Diploma in Kosrae					
	2004-2005			2005-2006		
	#Seniors	#Graduates	%Graduated	#Seniors	#Graduates	%Graduated
Seniors without IEPs	198	190	96%	133	127	95%
Seniors with IEPs	19	13	68%	17	14	82%
All Seniors	217	203	94%	150	141	94%

POHNPEI:

POHNPEI State LEA	# & % Graduates with a Diploma in Pohnpei					
	2004-2005			2005-2006		
	#Seniors	#Graduates	%Graduated	#Seniors	#Graduates	%Graduated
Seniors without IEPs	524	505	96%	549	524	95%
Seniors with IEPs	9	7	78%	8	5	63%
All Seniors	533	512	96%	557	529	95%

YAP:

YAP State LEA	# & % Graduates with a Diploma in Yap					
	2004-2005			2005-2006		
	#Seniors	#Graduates	%Graduated	#Seniors	#Graduates	%Graduated
Seniors without IEPs	201	194	97%	204	203	99%
Seniors with IEPs	9	8	89%	7	7	100%
All Seniors	210	202	96%	211	210	99%

FSM’s 2005-2006 overall National data of 83% exceeded the SPP target of 74%, which represents “progress” for this Indicator. Pohnpei State was the only FSM State that did not meet the FSM SPP target of 74%. Although Pohnpei State reported a decrease in percentage from 78% in 2004-2005 to 63% in 2005-2006, the difference in the number of graduates with IEPs and enrolled seniors with IEPs was only 1: 7 out of 9 for 78% in 2004-2005 and 5 out of 8 for 63% in 2005-2006. It should be noted that given the small numbers that each of the FSM LEA reports, changes in numbers, even by 1, can significantly change the percentage reported.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

OSEP SPP Letter, March 20, 2006

Table A under “Required Action” of the OSEP SPP Letter dated March 20, 2006 stated “FSM should reconsider the baseline data for Indicators 1 and 2 of the SPP and provide accurate, updated data and improvement activities in the FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007. Failure to accurately report information for these indicators may affect OSEP’s determination of FSM’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.”

The data reported for 2004-2005 reflected a comparison between youth with IEPs and youth without IEPs. This was used as a “drill down” method to review the 2 groups that make up “all youth.” For 2004-2005 and 2005-2006, the percentage reported for youth without IEPs was close to, if not the same percentage as all youth. One of the factors for this similarity is that the number of youth with IEPs represented as seniors is low and does not affect the overall calculation. The actual data for 2005-2006 display the numbers and percentages for all three groups: Seniors without IEPs, seniors with IEPs, and all seniors. The numbers collected were taken from each FSM State LEA special education office and education data office. The number of graduates with IEPs represents the same number reported in the 2005-2006 618 Exiting Report submitted to WESTAT and OSEP.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

“Graduation with a high school diploma” is defined in the FSM as the completion of required course credits during high school, with each FSM State LEA establishing the required total number of course credits to complete. Although FSM exceeded its SPP target for the reporting year, there were concerns raised with the apparently “low” numbers of enrolled seniors with IEPs. This was noted in the FSM SPP submitted in December 2005 and was prioritized for review as an improvement activity. One of the issues noted by the FSM State LEA Special Education Program is that the designation of enrolled grade assignment is based on course credits attained during the school year. Although enrolled as a high school student, a youth with an IEP would not be counted as a “senior” until course credits have been reached in anticipation of graduation for that year. This grade assignment procedure is applied similarly to youth without disabilities; however, for youth with IEPs, the low number of enrolled seniors raised questions as to their progression through high school. The FSM-HESA Special Education Program noted this as a priority area to address in school year 2006-2007.

As mentioned in FSM's SPP submitted in December 2005, FSM-HESA is working towards consistency in collecting, compiling, and reporting information for all students. Under the U.S. Interior Education Sector Grant, there are 20 Education Indicators that FSM-HESA has to report annual progress to the Joint Economic Management Committee (JEMCO). One of the 20 Indicators is the collection of graduation rates. Through increased accountability and with assistance from the Asian Development Bank, FSM-HESA is implementing the Education Management Information System (EMIS) to strengthen the education system in collecting, integrating, analyzing, disseminating, and reporting data and information on the education system in a consistent and uniform manner across the Nation, to include graduation rates. This continues to be “work in progress.” In the August 2006 FSM JEMCO 20 Education Indicators Report for school year 2005-2006, FSM-HESA indicated that there were inaccuracies and inconsistencies in collecting data for the report, which speak to the “work in progress” between FSM-HESA and the FSM State LEAs.

The graduation data reported in the August 2006 FSM JEMCO 20 Education Indicators Report show an aggregate accounting of graduate numbers and percentage for each FSM State and an overall National total. The numbers used for the calculation were different from the numbers provided for this APR Indicator. Given the inconsistencies noted in the August 2006 Report, FSM-HESA, in consultation with the FSM National Steering/SPP Committee, determined that the numbers used in this APR represents accurate data compiled by each FSM State special education office and education data office.

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

The merging of the FSM Special Education Student Information Tracking System (SITS) with the FSM Education Management Information System (EMIS) did not occur during the reporting year. The National Education office and the four State Education offices (LEAs) couldn't reach agreement on the version of the EMIS database and some of the specific data definitions and other elements to be collected and reported from the states to the National Education office. As a result, the LEAs chose to continue using Pacific Education Data Management System (PEDMS), an Excel database, to collect and report student and personnel data, among other data elements, to FSM Department of Health, Education and Social Affairs (FSM-HESA). FSM-HESA uses EMIS, a MicroSoft Access database, to aggregate and report student and personnel data generated from the LEAs' PEDMS data system. As such, the Special Education program had no database to interface with. Special Education student data continues to be manually collected and reported at the LEA levels.

Special Education participated in a series of meetings and workshops on the database development, including needed data elements and definitions of data terms. Special Education data requirements and definitions were shared to ensure a comprehensive data system is adopted that will include collection and reporting of students with disabilities.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2005-2006:

With the “work in progress” related to the development and implementation of the EMIS and SITS for collecting, tracking, and reporting graduation data, the following additional improvement activities have been included to focus on the “instructional” support needed for youth with IEPs. These activities are designed to support youth with IEPs progress through the high school grades completing course requirements, accordingly, to meet graduation requirements:

1. Facilitate training for secondary general education and special education teachers on effective strategies for providing secondary students with disabilities access to the general curriculum.
 - 1.1 Timeline: Annual
 - 1.2 Resource: Annual FSM-HESA Teacher Conference and on-site FSM State LEA sponsored training, with consultation from University of Hawaii Center for Disability Studies (UH CDS)
2. Develop and implement a system for monitoring student progress in the general education program to support the completion of required credits, at each grade level, for graduation. Student progress data will assist each FSM State LEA provide appropriate intervention, as needed.
 - 2.1 Timeline: Quarterly
 - 2.2 Resource: FSM State LEA Special Education Program, with consultation from University of Hawaii Center for Disability Studies (UH CDS)

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to overview provided on page 1.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	3% of youth with IEPs drop-out of high school.

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

For the 2005-2006 reporting period, FSM's percentage of youth with IEPs who dropped out was 1% (7/632), compared to all youth who dropped out at 6.9% (526/7608). The high school enrollment for 9th – 12th grade was verified through each FSM State LEA special education office and education data office.

2005-2006 School Year	# & % Drop-Outs in FSM		
	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop-Outs	%Drop-Outs
Youth without IEPs	6976	519	7.4%
Youth with IEPs	632	7	1%
All Youth	7608	526	6.9%

Actual data by FSM States, Local Education Agencies (LEAs), for 2004-2005 and 2005-2006:

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

CHUUK:

CHUUK State LEA	# & % Drop-Outs in Chuuk					
	2004-2005			2005-2006		
	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop-Outs	%Drop-Outs	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop-Outs	%Drop-Outs
Youth without IEPs	3280	442	13%	2996	199	7%
Youth with IEPs	435	4*	1%	415	3	.7%
All Youth	3715	446	12%	3411	202	6%

*Number represents drop-outs from 12th grade only

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

KOSRAE:

KOSRAE State LEA	# & % Drop-Outs in Kosrae					
	2004-2005			2005-2006		
	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop-Outs	%Drop-Outs	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop-Outs	%Drop-Outs
Youth without IEPs	776	26	3%	741	97	13%
Youth with IEPs	114	17	15%	116	0	0%
All Youth	890	43	5%	857	97	11%

POHNPEI:

POHNPEI State LEA	# & % Drop-Outs in Pohnpei					
	2004-2005			2005-2006		
	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop-Outs	%Drop-Outs	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop-Outs	%Drop-Outs
Youth without IEPs	2451	101	4%	2464	157	6.4%
Youth with IEPs	248	2	1%	80	3	4%
All Youth	2699	103	4%	2544	160	6.3%

YAP:

YAP State LEA	# & % Drop-Outs in Yap					
	2004-2005			2005-2006		
	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop-Outs	%Drop-Outs	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop-Outs	%Drop-Outs
Youth without IEPs	791	34	4%	775	66	9%
Youth with IEPs	55	5	9%	21	1	5%
All Youth	846	39	4.6%	796	67	8.4%

FSM’s 2005-2006 overall National data of 1% exceeded the SPP target of 3%, which represents “progress” for this Indicator. Pohnpei State and Yap State were the FSM States that did not meet or exceed the FSM SPP target reporting 4% (3/80) and 5% (1/21) drop-outs, respectively. However, it should be noted that the number of drop-outs for both FSM States were relatively small – 3 for Pohnpei State and 1 for Yap State. In fact, Yap State decreased in the number of drop-outs from 5 in 2004-2005 to 1 in 2005-2006 and Pohnpei increased the number of drop-outs by only 1 from 2 in 2004-2005 to 3 in 2005-2006.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

OSEP SPP Letter, March 20, 2006

Table A under “Required Action” of the OSEP SPP Letter dated March 20, 2006 stated “FSM should reconsider the baseline data for Indicators 1 and 2 of the SPP and provide accurate, updated data and improvement activities in the FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007. Failure to accurately report information for these indicators may affect OSEP’s determination of FSM’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.”

Similar to Indicator 1, graduation data, the drop-out data reported for 2004-2005 reflected a comparison between youth with IEPs and youth without IEPs. This was used as a “drill down” method to review the 2 groups that make up “all youth.” For 2004-2005 and 2005-2006, the percentage reported for youth without IEPs represented close to if not the same percentage as all youth. One of the factors for this similarity is that the number of youth with IEPs represented as 9th-12th graders is low and does not significantly affect the overall calculation. The actual data for 2005-2006 display the numbers and percentages for all three groups: Youth without IEPs, youth with IEPs, and all youth (9th-12th grade). The numbers collected were taken from each FSM State LEA special education office and education data office. The number of drop-outs with IEPs represents the same number reported in the 2005-2006 618 Exiting Report submitted to WESTAT and OSEP.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

As mentioned in FSM's SPP submitted in December 2005, FSM-HESA is working towards consistency in collecting, compiling, and reporting information for all students. Under the U.S. Interior Education Sector Grant, there are 20 Education Indicators that FSM-HESA has to report annual progress to the Joint Economic Management Committee (JEMCO). One of the 20 Indicators is the collection of drop-out rates. Through increased accountability and with assistance from the Asian Development Bank, FSM-HESA is implementing the Education Management Information System (EMIS) to strengthen the education system in collecting, integrating, analyzing, disseminating, and reporting data and information on the education system in a consistent and uniform manner across the Nation, to include drop-out rates. This continues to be "work in progress." In the August 2006 FSM JEMCO 20 Education Indicators Report for school year 2005-2006, FSM-HESA indicated that there were inaccuracies and inconsistencies in collecting data for the report, which speak to the "work in progress" between FSM-HESA and the FSM State LEA.

The drop-out data reported in the August 2006 FSM JEMCO 20 Education Indicators Report show an aggregate accounting of drop-out percentage for Chuuk State Elementary and Secondary, and Kosrae State Secondary. As noted, Pohnpei State reported incorrect data and Yap State did not provide drop-out data. The numbers used for the percentage calculation were not shown for Chuuk State and Kosrae State. Given the inconsistencies noted in the August 2006 Report, FSM-HESA, in consultation with the FSM National Steering/SPP Committee, determined that the numbers used in this APR represents accurate data compiled by each FSM State special education office and education data office.

The following describes progress made on the implementation of the improvement activities identified in FSM's SPP, which is similar to the progress and issues raised in Indicator 1, Graduation:

The merging of the FSM Special Education Student Information Tracking System (SITS) with the FSM Education Management Information System (EMIS) did not occur during the reporting year. The National Education office and the four State Education offices (LEAs) couldn't reach agreement on the version of the EMIS database and some of the specific data definitions and other elements to be collected and reported from the states to the National Education office. As a result, the LEAs chose to continue using Pacific Education Data Management System (PEDMS), an Excel database, to collect and report out student and personnel data, among other data elements, to FSM Department of Health, Education and Social Affairs (FSM-HESA). FSM-HESA uses EMIS, a MicroSoft Access database, to aggregate and report student and personnel data generated from the LEAs' PEDMS data system. As such, the Special Education program had no database to interface with. Special Education student data continues to be manually collected and reported at the LEA levels.

Special Education participated in a series of meetings and workshops on the database development, including the needed data elements and definitions of data terms. Special Education data requirements and definitions were shared to ensure a comprehensive data system is adopted that will include collection and reporting of students with disabilities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2005-2006:

With the "work in progress" related to the development and implementation of the EMIS and SITS for collecting, tracking, and reporting drop-out data, the additional improvement activities included under Indicator 1 for graduation rates will serve to address the continued "instructional" support for preventing youth with IEPs from dropping out from school.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to overview provided on page 1.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Measurement:

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

B. Participation rate =

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

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

Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)].

C. Proficiency rate =

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

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

Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)].

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Not Applicable to FSM. B. 60% participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards. C. Proficiency rate to be determined in 2005-2006 for children with IEPs in regular and alternate assessment who performed at the proficient or above level.

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

Measurement A: Not Applicable to FSM

Measurement B: Overall FSM Total Participation Rate by Content & Grade, 618 Table 6

NST Content & Grade	FSM TOTAL # & %: 2005-2006 National Standardized Test (NST) Results for Participation by Content & Grade					
	a. # in Grade	b. # NO Accommodations	c. # with Accommodations	d. # Alternate Assess – Grade Level Standards	e. # Alternate Assess – Alternate Standards	% b + c + d + e divided by a x 100
READING						
Grade 6	137	52	0	0	0	38% (52/137)
Grade 8	119	51	0	0	0	43% (51/119)
Grade 10	57	26	0	0	0	46% (26/57)
TOTAL #	313	129	0	0	0	
TOTAL %		41% (129/313)	0	0	0	41% (129/313)
MATH						
Grade 6	135	45	0	0	0	33% (45/135)
Grade 8	120	58	0	0	0	48% (58/120)
Grade 10	57	19	0	0	0	33% (19/57)
TOTAL #	312	122	0	0	0	
TOTAL %		39% (122/312)	0	0	0	39%(122/312)

Reasons for non-participation, as reported by the FSM State Local Education Agencies (LEAs), were schedule for testing and travel conflicts due to weather and transportation to outer islands, and inconsistent implementation of procedures between the LEA Special Education Office and Assessment Team regarding the participation of students with IEPs in the assessment system.

Measurement C: Overall FSM Total Proficiency Rates by Content & Grade, 618 Table 6

NST Content & Grade	FSM TOTAL # & %: 2005-2006 National Standardized Test (NST) Results for Proficiency by Content & Grade					
	a. # in Grade	b. # Proficient or Above in Regular Assess with No Accommodations	c. # Proficient or Above in Regular Assess with Accommodations	d. # Proficient or Above in Alternate Assess – Grade Level Standards	e. # Proficient or Above in Alternate Assess – Alternate Standards	% b + c + d + e divided by a x 100
READING						
Grade 6	137	8	0	0	0	6% (8/137)
Grade 8	119	6	0	0	0	5% (6/119)
Grade 10	57	9	0	0	0	16% (9/57)
TOTAL #	313	23	0	0	0	
TOTAL %		7% (23/313)	0	0	0	7% (23/313)

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

NST Content & Grade	FSM TOTAL # & %: 2005-2006 National Standardized Test (NST) Results for Proficiency by Content & Grade					
	a. # in Grade	b. # Proficient or Above in Regular Assess with No Accommodations	c. # Proficient or Above in Regular Assess with Accommodations	d. # Proficient or Above in Alternate Assess – Grade Level Standards	e. # Proficient or Above in Alternate Assess – Alternate Standards	% b + c + d + e divided by a x 100
MATH						
Grade 6	135	6	0	0	0	4% (6/135)
Grade 8	120	2	0	0	0	2% (2/120)
Grade 10	57	2	0	0	0	4% (2/57)
TOTAL #	312	10	0	0	0	
TOTAL%		3% (10/312)	0	0	0	3% (10/312)

As shown in the actual data for 2005-2006, participation and performance data were provided for students with disabilities who participated in FSM’s regular assessment, the National Standardized Test (NST), without accommodations. (refer to Table 6 attached) **FSM did not meet its overall target of 60% participation rate for 2005-2006, but was able to maintain a similar participation percentage for the 2 reporting years: 43% in 2004-2005 and 41% (129/313) for Reading and 39%(122/312) for Math in 2005-2006.** For proficiency rates, the actual data for 2005-2006 will serve as baseline with targets established at 1% increases in subsequent years. The baseline data for “proficient or above,” defined by FSM-HESA as those students with IEPs scoring in the SIN (Significant Improvement Needed) and Mastery levels, were an overall 7% (23/313) for Reading and 3% (10/312) for Math. As reported, no alternate assessments were administered to students with disabilities.

In addition, as reported in the attached Table 6, for Reading, 34% or 106 of the total 313 in the grades assessed scored “not proficient” based on the NST proficiency levels. This accounts for 32% (44/137) for 6th grade, 38% (45/119) for 8th grade, and 30% (17/57) for 10th grade. The total number of reported proficient and above and “not proficient” equals the total number of students with IEPs who had taken the NST, with the overall percentage “proficient” and “not proficient” based on the total number of students with IEPs in the assessed grades (Measurement “a”).

For Math, 36% or 112 of the total 312 in the grades assessed scored “not proficient” based on the NST proficiency levels. This accounts for 29% (39/135) for 6th grade, 47% (56/120) for 8th grade, and 30% (17/57) for 10th grade. The total number of reported proficient and above and “not proficient” equals the total number of students with IEPs who had taken the NST, with the overall percentage “proficient” and “not proficient” based on the total number of students with IEPs in the assessed grades (Measurement “a”).

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

OSEP SPP Letter, March 20, 2006

Tables A & B under “Issues & Required Action” of the OSEP SPP Letter, dated March 20, 2006, stated “FSM did not provide baseline data for participation in the alternate assessment, or on performance on the NST and alternate assessment. FSM must review, and if necessary revise, its improvement strategies to ensure they will enable FSM to demonstrate correction of this noncompliance in the FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007. Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may affect OSEP’s determination of FSM’s status under section 616(d) of IDEA.”

Although providing performance data demonstrates FSM’s commitment to improving its accountability system for all students, including students with disabilities, FSM was not able to implement an alternate assessment. In addition, the fact that FSM reported students with disabilities participating in the NST did not include students requiring accommodations raised some concerns regarding the effectiveness of the

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

“participation determination” by the IEP team OR the communication between each FSM State Local Education Agency (LEA) Special Education Office and the Assessment Team administering the NST. As noted earlier, in some situations, inconsistencies in implementation procedures between the FSM State LEA Special Education Office and the Assessment Team was evident.

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

FSM has in place special education procedures that provide specific steps for the IEP team to determine individually whether the student is able to participate, in all or part, of the NST with or without accommodations, or whether an alternate assessment would be required. Training has been conducted in each FSM State LEA regarding the implementation of these “participation determination” procedures.

In the SPP submitted in December 2005, FSM indicated that it had developed guidelines for implementing an alternate assessment for students with disabilities who are not able to participate in FSM's regular assessment, the FSM National Standardized Test (NST) administered to 6th, 8th, and 10th grade students. FSM provided OSEP with a copy of the established guidelines. However, based on feedback from the FSM State LEAs, it was determined that additional technical support for the implementation of an alternate assessment, as well as support for the disaggregation of relevant special education participation and performance data on the NST, would be needed. FSM-HESA therefore requested the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS) for additional technical assistance. Guam CEDDERS applied for and received funding for the Pacific Assessment Consortium (PAC6) Project, effective January 2006 – December 2006, through the IDEA General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) competition specific to state-wide assessment planning.

The PAC6 Project is a consortium project designed to provide technical support to all six Pacific Basin entities, including FSM, in the critical planning needed for re-designing or enhancing a comprehensive assessment state-wide assessment system, inclusive of students with disabilities. In July 2006, Guam CEDDERS facilitated an initial training on Guam for the PAC6 Project Leadership Assessment Teams from all six Pacific Basin entities, including FSM. The July 2006 training was co-facilitated by Guam CEDDERS and key project partners, the National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO) and the Western Regional Resource Center (WRRRC), as well as the University of Guam regional expert and a state-model consultant from the District of Maui of the Hawaii Department of Education. As a result of the 3-day July 2006 training, FSM started developing a specific “action plan” to address the long-term re-design of its data compilation and reporting of accurate participation and performance data of students with disabilities taking the NST and/or alternate assessment.

Additional technical support for the completion of FSM's individual jurisdiction plan or “action plan” was provided during the January 2007 5-day Assessment Institute on Guam with national, regional, and local experts on assessment systems, including key partners from the University of Guam, NCEO, WRRRC, and consultants from the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, Inc. (NCIEA), New Hampshire, and the Inclusive Large Scale Standards and Assessment (ILSSA), University of Kentucky.

Realizing the additional technical expertise needed to fulfill the critical planning and implementation of an inclusive assessment system given FSM's educational context, including geographic and language challenges, FSM, once again, requested Guam CEDDERS for additional technical support in the implementation of the FSM-specific plan for enhancing its state-wide assessment system, inclusive of students with disabilities. Guam CEDDERS applied for and received funding for the Pacific Assessment Consortium: FSM's Implementation Project under the IDEA GSEG competition. The award is effective January 2007 through December 2007. The outcomes of the implementation project will provide FSM with revised guidelines and training materials for ensuring accurate reporting of the participation and performance of students with disabilities in the NST or an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards.

Although FSM has not met all the requirements for reporting data for this Indicator, it has demonstrated commitment to accessing available resources in support of its efforts to improve its state-wide

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

assessment system. Accessing critical national experts in the area of assessment can be costly and time intensive for consultants. The PAC6 planning and implementation projects bring together the resources to the Pacific Basin region for all entities to access, learn from, and apply the critical systemic changes needed for institutionalizing a true accountability system inclusive of students with disabilities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/ Resources for 2005-2006:

As noted in the OSEP SPP Letter, the following revisions to the improvement activities have been made given the availability of the IDEA funded GSEG PAC6 planning and implementation projects facilitated by Guam CEDDERS:

1. 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.
 - 1.1 Timeline: Beginning 2006-2007 and annually during the IEP Reviews
 - 1.2 Resource: FSM State LEA Special Education Program Specialists/Supervisors

2. Pilot implementation of an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards for targeted Reading and Math skills for reporting accurate participation and performance data for students with significant cognitive disabilities who are not able to take the NST in the 2006-2007 school year.
 - 2.1 Timeline: March – May 2007 NST Testing Period
 - 2.2 Resource: GSEG PAC6 Project: January 2007 Assessment Institute and Follow-Up On-Site Visit facilitated by Guam CEDDERS, in collaboration with the National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO) and the Western Regional Resource Center (WRRRC)

3. The completion of a jurisdiction specific FSM plan utilizing a self-assessment process following the NCLB Peer Review Guidance, as adapted by the GSEG PAC6 Project.
 - 3.1 Timeline: April 2007
 - 3.2 Resource: GSEG PAC6 Project: January 2007 Assessment Institute and Follow-Up On-Site Visit facilitated by Guam CEDDERS, in collaboration with the National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO) and the Western Regional Resource Center (WRRRC)

4. Implementation of the jurisdiction specific FSM plan for re-designing/enhancing FSM's state-wide assessment system, including the determination and implementation of appropriate accommodations for the general assessment, the development of an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards, and the facilitation of on-site training for administrators, teachers, and parents in each FSM State LEA.
 - 4.1 Timeline: Pilot design January 2007, pilot test Spring 2007, generation of pilot data Summer 2007, operational 2007-2008, training beginning April 2007 and annually
 - 4.2 Resource: GSEG Pacific Assessment Consortium: FSM's Implementation Project facilitated by Guam CEDDERS, in collaboration with the National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO) and the Western Regional Resource Center (WRRRC), and the FSM State LEA members on the FSM Leadership Assessment Team

5. Beginning school year 2006-2007, interface SPP assessment data requirements with EMIS and the special education Student Information Tracking System (SITS) for reporting accurate and timely data for all levels: School, LEA, and National, to include federal reporting for assessment data.
 - 5.1 Timeline: Full implementation in 2006-2007 with annual upgrades and verification of accuracy in data collected through the LEA quarterly reports and annual FSM-HESA monitoring/verification visits.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

- 5.2 Resource: Technical support from appropriate Institution of Higher Education (IHE) or other technical assistance provider for data system upgrades; FSM-HESA Assessment Specialist for NST and Evaluation Specialist for EMIS implementation.
6. Continue monitoring the implementation of the special education procedures for participation rate, as well as proficiency rates, in the nation-wide assessment system, including the provisions for appropriate accommodations and an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards, in each LEA through the LEA quarterly reports to FSM-HESA and the FSM-HESA on-site monitoring/verification visits, as scheduled during the school year.
- 6.1 Timeline: Quarterly for LEA reports. Annual monitoring visits to each state. Analysis of the reports will assist FSM-HESA with prioritizing nation-wide targeted improvement activities for increasing participation and proficiency rates in subsequent years.
- 6.2 Resource: Technical support from appropriate IHE or technical assistance provider for monitoring visit; GSEG PAC6 Implementation Project Evaluation Toolkit

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to overview provided on page 1.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Measurement:

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Rates of suspension and expulsion: A. 0% of districts/LEAs identified by FSM as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and B. Not Applicable to FSM.

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

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

As shown in the Tables below, FSM met its target of 0% significant discrepancy of LEAs. FSM-HESA did not report any student with an IEP with a single suspension greater than 10 days or multiple suspensions greater than 10 days for 2005-2006 in the 618 Discipline Table.

CHUUK:

Child Count Reporting Period	Total # with IEPs*	Chuuk Reported 618 Suspension Data for the School Year					
		Single Suspensions > than 10 Days		Multiple Suspensions > than 10 Days		TOTAL # & %	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2004	1179	0	0	0	0	0	0
December 1, 2005	1312	0	0	0	0	0	0

*Child Count Total for Ages 3-21

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

KOSRAE:

Child Count Reporting Period	Total # with IEPs*	Kosrae Reported 618 Suspension Data for the School Year					
		Single Suspensions > than 10 Days		Multiple Suspensions > than 10 Days		TOTAL # & %	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2004	249	0	0	0	0	0	0
December 1, 2005	270	0	0	0	0	0	0

*Child Count Total for Ages 3-21

POHNPEI:

Child Count Reporting Period	Total # with IEPs*	Pohnpei Reported 618 Suspension Data for the School Year					
		Single Suspensions > than 10 Days		Multiple Suspensions > than 10 Days		TOTAL # & %	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2004	843	0	0	0	0	0	0
December 1, 2005	913	0	0	0	0	0	0

*Child Count Total for Ages 3-21

YAP:

Child Count Reporting Period	Total # with IEPs*	Yap Reported 618 Suspension Data for the School Year					
		Single Suspensions > than 10 Days		Multiple Suspensions > than 10 Days		TOTAL # & %	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2004	169	0	0	0	0	0	0
December 1, 2005	124	0	0	0	0	0	0

*Child Count Total for Ages 3-21

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

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

OSEP SPP Letter, March 20, 2006

Table B under “Required Action” of the OSEP SPP Letter dated March 20, 2006 referred to “Required Action” for Indicator 20 in Table A. The “Required Action” for Indicator 20 stated that “FSM should reconsider the baseline data for Indicators 1 and 2 of the SPP and provide accurate, updated data and improvement activities in the FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007. Failure to accurately report information for these indicators may affect OSEP’s determination of FSM’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.”

In reviewing the “Required Action” from OSEP’s SPP Letter, there was no mention of issues related to the data provided for Indicator 4. FSM will therefore continue using the FSM State LEA comparison data for this Indicator, which was reported data in the 618 Discipline Table.

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

The agreement to the “suspension/expulsion” definition and other data terms are part of the overall effort to agree to and adopt a final version of the Education Management Information System (EMIS) undertaken in 2005-2006. The final version has not been fully agreed to by the four FSM State LEAs and FSM-HESA. Notwithstanding, special education continues to use the OSEP suspension and expulsion

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

definition to collect and report its data. Another issue the special education program is faced with when collecting data is that suspension and expulsion data are not consistently maintained in the schools.

As part of special education Student Information Tracking System (SITS) database implementation, a data guide to include terms and definitions will be completed by March 2007. Data terms and procedural instructions will be developed and aligned with the 618 OSEP guides and terms. The training that is proposed for March 2007 will cover all the required data tables, to include the new data Tables 6 and 7 and the revised Table 3. A workshop covering the basic data collection requirements is needed for the fact that there are two new data staff in two of the FSM States (Chuuk and Yap).

Proposed training activities are intended to ensure that data staff understand each of the 618 data Table, fill out and analyze each Table using paper and pencil, and also to input into the database on a computer, and print out queried reports and analyze them. Data specialists attending the training will serve as trainers to conduct similar training activities in the FSM States. General education data specialists will be invited and will be included as trained trainers to facilitate local level training.

Training on the revised SITS will take place during the same time in March 2007. In general, the IEP forms will be reviewed against the SITS forms for accurate data entry. Assessment preparation will be discussed as the 2007 FSM National Standardized Test (NST) will happen between April and May 2007. On-site technical assistance will be provided during FSM-HESA State/LEA monitoring and verification or as may be requested by a FSM State.

Developments in data collection and SITS implementation will be presented to the FSM Association of Chief State School Officers (FACSSO), comprised of the LEA Directors of Education, Secretary of FSM-HESA, and the President of the College of Micronesia-FSM, in at least one of their regular meetings in 2007.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2005-2006:

No revisions to the improvement activities at this time.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to overview provided on page 1.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;¹
- B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or
- C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% 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 public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Based on the unique needs of each child with a disability, on December 1, 2005, the percent of children with IEPs ages 6 through 21 served to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. 97% Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day; B. 0% Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; and C. 3% Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

FSM DATA: OSEP 618 LRE Placement Data

Reporting Period	FSM Total # with IEPs	% Removed from Regular Class (ages 6 through 21)					
		Measurement A Less than 21%		Measurement B Greater than 60%		Measurement C Separate Schools, Residential, Homebound, Hospital Placements	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2004	2163	2099	97%	0	0	64	3%
December 1, 2005	2299	2147	93%	0	0	152	7%

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

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

OSEP 618 LRE Placement Data by FSM LEAs for 2004-2005 & 2005-2006:

CHUUK: 2002-2005: Number & Percentage of Students (Age 6-21) By Educational Environment

Reporting Period	CHUUK Total # with IEPs	% Removed from Regular Class (ages 6 through 21)					
		Measurement A Less than 21%		Measurement B Greater than 60%		Measurement C Separate Schools, Residential, Homebound, Hospital Placements	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2002	770	716	93%	0	0	54	7%
December 1, 2003	867	867	100%	0	0	0	0
December 1, 2004	990	990	100%	0	0	0	0
December 1, 2005*	1073	976	91%	0	0	97	9%

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

KOSRAE: 2002-2005: Number & Percentage of Students (Age 6-21) By Educational Environment

Reporting Period	KOSRAE Total # with IEPs	% Removed from Regular Class (ages 6 through 21)					
		Measurement A Less than 21%		Measurement B Greater than 60%		Measurement C Separate Schools, Residential, Homebound, Hospital Placements	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2002	232	203	88%	0	0	29	12%
December 1, 2003	311	295	95%	0	0	16	5%
December 1, 2004	222	198	89%	0	0	24	11%
December 1, 2005	240	219	91%	0	0	21	9%

POHNPEI: 2002-2005: Number & Percentage of Students (Age 6-21) By Educational Environment

Reporting Period	POHNPEI Total # with IEPs	% Removed from Regular Class (ages 6 through 21)					
		Measurement A Less than 21%		Measurement B Greater than 60%		Measurement C Separate Schools, Residential, Homebound, Hospital Placements	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2002	822	746	91%	44	5%	32	4%
December 1, 2003	808	784	97%	0	0	24	3%
December 1, 2004	792	773	98%	0	0	19	2%
December 1, 2005	869	845	97%	0	0	24	3%

YAP: 2002-2005: Number & Percentage of Students (Age 6-21) By Educational Environment

Reporting Period	YAP Total # with IEPs	% Removed from Regular Class (ages 6 through 21)					
		Measurement A Less than 21%		Measurement B Greater than 60%		Measurement C Separate Schools, Residential, Homebound, Hospital Placements	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2002	216	177	82%	21	10%	18	8%
December 1, 2003	216	175	81%	23	11%	18	8%
December 1, 2004	159	138	87%	0	0	21	13%
December 1, 2005	117	107	91%	0	0	10	9%

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

FSM did not meet its SPP targets for 2 of the 3 Indicator Measurements in 2005-2006:

- Measurement A: Less than 21%: Target set at 97%, with performance at 93%.
- Measurement B: Greater than 60%: Target set at 0%, with performance at 0%.
- Measurement C: Separate Schools/Homebound: Target set at 3%, with performance at 7%.

As shown in the actual data Tables for the FSM State LEAs, Chuuk State made a significant correction to its 2005-2006 reported 618 LRE data, which impacted the overall performance for meeting the 2005-2006 SPP Targets. In the 2003 and 2004 reporting years, Chuuk State did not report students with disabilities served in separate schools or through home services. However, during FSM-HESA's on-site monitoring visit in September 2006 and OSEP's on-site monitoring visit in October 2006, Chuuk State verified its data with the OSEP educational placement definitions and corrected its December 1, 2005 reported 618 data to include students with disabilities receiving special education and related services in a separate school (Special Education Center) and home services. Chuuk State's data correction reflects an accurate accounting of school-age LRE.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

The SPP targets were established based on the trend data presented during the stakeholder meetings in 2005. During the January 2007 FSM National Steering/SPP Committee meeting, members discussed the data change for Chuuk State and how that could possibly impact FSM meeting the overall target each year. During the discussion, it was made clear that the determination of "placement," where services are required to be provided, is based on an individual need and not on the SPP target established. The special education procedures are aligned with the IDEA LRE requirements setting the decision for service delivery based on the individual needs of the student with a disability. The committee expressed an understanding of the LRE provisions and recommended that the SPP targets remain the same until additional trend data for placement and personnel training have been reviewed to assess the appropriateness of the SPP targets established.

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

All the FSM States conducted training activities for teachers, staff, and parents on the special education procedural process to ensure children are identified in and out of school and are properly assessed for eligibility. The procedural manual was recently revised and aligned with the new requirements of IDEA 2004. All the FSM States were involved in the revision process of the procedural manual. In addition, LEA Coordinators and Steering/Advisory Chairpersons and members were provided with overview sessions on the revised manual as trainers to facilitate workshops in their respective FSM States.

During the FSM Parent & Consumer Conference: "*Accept and Respect Everyone's Uniqueness*" held on August 2-5, 2006 in Yap State, awareness sessions designed for family members were held on the IEP process, LRE determination, and parent rights.

As indicated, the Student Information Tracking System (SITS) had to be restructured to include the new data requirements resulting from IDEA 2004. The restructuring also anticipates the changes to be made to the Education Management Information System (EMIS) for full implementation in all LEAs and FSM-HESA. To better control the restructuring of the SITS database, only Pohnpei State was beta-testing the system. All LEAs continue to collect and report data manually using the terms and definitions derived from the OSEP/WESTAT data Tables, including School-Age LRE.

Reported 618 data and other data reports required from the LEAs continue to be monitored through the LEA quarterly reports, on-site monitoring/verification visits, and targeted monitoring visits. As per the updated FSM *Continuous Improvement* Monitoring System, four levels of performances or "determination levels" have been established to provide incentive or sanctions based on data reports and performances of FSM State resulting from monitoring visits compared to the FSM State annual Local Performance Plan (LPP).

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

All FSM States have requested that FSM-HESA provide additional technical assistance to facilitate more comprehensive workshops for special education personnel, principals, department of education administrators and specialist, and parents and Advisory council members. This training need has been incorporated into the on-site monitoring and verification schedule for school year 2006-2007. Focused monitoring and verification to FSM States requiring assistance will also include follow up on how the FSM States are implementing the procedural manual.

Part of the effort to develop personnel to provide quality services following the established procedures, including the LRE provisions, is reflected in three personnel development projects: Related Service Assistant (RSA) trainings, Associate of Arts degree in Special Education, and a Bachelor of Arts in Special Education specialization.

1. Related Service Assistant (RSA) Training. This project is through a Pacific Paraprofessional and Related Services Education Program (PREP) grant project out of the University of Hawaii in partnership with the College of Micronesia-Federated States of Micronesia (COM-FSM). This project is a third-year 30-credit certificate program for special educators to learn skills to support the related services needs of children with low-incidence disabilities in the Pacific. Project year 2005-06 resulted in 16 new RSAs certified. Chuuk-2, Kosrae-3, Pohnpei-9, Yap-2, and 7 from the Republic of the Marshall Islands. All 16 FSM trainees who started completed the one-year 5 training institutes.
2. Associate of Arts in Special Education Certification. This training project is facilitated by COM-FSM. 100 teachers have been targeted to complete this third-year certification training program. The project started Summer 2006 and will end Fall 2008. Number of teachers currently identified: Chuuk-53, Pohnpei-4, and Yap-41.
3. Bachelors of Arts in Special Education. This project is facilitated by San Diego State University (SDSU). This 17 3-unit course (51 credits) program is a blend of the SDSU School of Teacher Education, Department of Special Education, Department of Educational Technology, and the Department of Administration, Rehabilitation and Post Secondary Education, specifically designed to provide special education teachers with a strong foundation in research-based educational philosophy and instructional methods. Sixty-Three (63) teachers are enrolled in the project, including: Chuuk-13, Kosrae-26, and Pohnpei-24.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2005-2006:

As recommended by the FSM National Steering/SPP Committee in January 2007, although Chuuk State's data had been corrected, the projected SPP targets for subsequent years will remain the same at this time.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to overview provided on page 1.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Based on the unique needs of each preschooler with a disability, on December 1, 2005, 30% of preschool children with IEPs will receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

FSM DATA: OSEP 618 LRE Placement Data for Ages 3-5

Reporting Period	FSM Total # with IEPs	% in Settings with Typically Developing Peers (3-5)						FSM Total	
		Early Childhood (EC) Setting		Home		Part-Time EC Setting & Part-Time EC/Special Education Setting		Settings with Typically Developing Peers	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	%
December 1, 2004	277	57	21%	26	9%	0	0	83	30%
December 1, 2005	320	41	13%	69	22%	0	0	110	34%

OSEP 618 LRE Settings Data for Ages 3-5 by FSM Local Education Agencies (LEAs)

CHUUK: 2002-2005: OSEP 618 LRE Settings Data for Ages 3-5

Reporting Period	CHUUK Total # with IEPs	% in Settings with Typically Developing Peers (3-5)						Chuuk Total	
		Early Childhood (EC) Setting		Home		Part-Time EC Setting & Part-Time EC/Special Education Setting		Settings with Typically Developing Peers	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	%
December 1, 2002	283	71	25%	0	0	0	0	71	25%
December 1, 2003	168	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
December 1, 2004	189	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
December 1, 2005	239	0	0	34	14%	0	0	34	14%

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

KOSRAE: 2002-2005: OSEP 618 LRE Settings Data for Ages 3-5

Reporting Period	KOSRAE Total # with IEPs	% in Settings with Typically Developing Peers (3-5)						Kosrae Total	
		Early Childhood (EC) Setting		Home		Part-Time EC Setting & Part-Time EC/Special Education Setting		Settings with Typically Developing Peers	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	%
December 1, 2002	59	40	68%	18	30%	0	0	58	98%
December 1, 2003	43	35	81%	7	16%	0	0	42	97%
December 1, 2004	27	19	70%	3	11%	0	0	22	81%
December 1, 2005	30	22	73%	3	10%	0	0	25	83%

POHNPEI: 2002-2005: OSEP 618 LRE Settings Data for Ages 3-5

Reporting Period	POHNPEI Total # with IEPs	% in Settings with Typically Developing Peers (3-5)						Pohnpei Total	
		Early Childhood (EC) Setting		Home		Part-Time EC Setting & Part-Time EC/Special Education Setting		Settings with Typically Developing Peers	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	%
December 1, 2002	32	17	53%	15	47%	0	0	32	100%
December 1, 2003	98	62	63%	36	37%	0	0	98	100%
December 1, 2004	51	32	63%	19	37%	0	0	51	100%
December 1, 2005*	44	16	36%	28	64%	0	0	44	100%

*Pohnpei State revised 618 Preschool-Age LRE data submitted to FSM-HESA; FSM-HESA submitted correction to FSM total to WESTAT

YAP: 2002-2005: OSEP 618 LRE Settings Data for Ages 3-5

Reporting Period	YAP Total # with IEPs	% in Settings with Typically Developing Peers (3-5)						Yap Total	
		Early Childhood (EC) Setting		Home		Part-Time EC Setting & Part-Time EC/Special Education Setting		Settings with Typically Developing Peers	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	%
December 1, 2002	68	8	12%	60	88%	0	0	68	100%
December 1, 2003	70	8	11%	62	89%	0	0	70	100%
December 1, 2004	10	6	60%	4	40%	0	0	10	100%
December 1, 2005	7	3	43%	4	57%	0	0	7	100%

FSM's 2005-2006 overall National data of 34% exceeded the SPP target of 30%, which represents "progress" for this Indicator. By FSM State LEAs, Chuuk State was the only FSM State that did not meet the FSM SPP target for the reporting year. Chuuk State reported 14% (34/239) of preschoolers with IEPs provided home services; while Kosrae State reported 83% (25/30), Pohnpei State at 100% (44/44), and Yap State at 100% (7/7).

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

OSEP SPP Letter, March 20, 2006

Table A under "Required Action" of the OSEP SPP Letter dated March 20, 2006 stated "In the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, FSM must provide data on the number of children with IEPs, aged 3-5, in Chuuk, and the number of such children in settings with typically developing peers. FSM must also provide an explanation of the setting for each child with an IEP, aged 3-5, in Chuuk, who is not in a setting with typically developing peers. If the data and information indicate noncompliance with 34 CFR §§300.550-300.552, FSM must submit, in the FFY 2005 APR, a plan with strategies, proposed evidence of change, targets, and timelines designed to ensure compliance within one year of its identification."

As noted in FSM's SPP submitted in December 2005, FSM-HESA targeted specific technical assistance for Chuuk State to address the LRE provisions for preschoolers with disabilities. As a SPP improvement activity for Indicator #6 (FSM SPP, page 27), FSM-HESA conducted on-site verification visits in June 2006 and August 2006 to Chuuk State to specifically review procedural compliance with preschool LRE, as well as information for addressing the preschool outcomes requirements. These visits were considered "initial" verification visits to assess current practices based on the procedural requirements. The visits included meetings with special education staff, early childhood staff (formerly under the Head Start Program), and verification of class rosters.

As shown in Chuuk State's Table for the OSEP 618 Settings Data for December 1, 2005 (page 22 of this APR), Chuuk State reported a total 239 preschoolers with IEPs; of which, 14% (34/239) received home services, one of the settings for typically developing peers. This reported data was different from Chuuk State's previous year's data of no preschoolers with IEPs in settings for typically developing peers, and was verified during the "Initial" verification visits conducted in June 2006 and August 2006.

From September 11-12, 2006, FSM-HESA conducted an on-site focused monitoring to Chuuk State to assess Chuuk State's procedures for providing IDEA Part B preschool services. The FSM-HESA Focused Monitoring Report was issued on September 19, 2006. The findings and required actions included the following:

1. **Preschool Program:** Findings: Program serves preschoolers with IEPs in a segregated setting, the Special Education Center, and in the homes. Procedures for identifying, referring, evaluating, and providing services to eligible preschoolers with disabilities automatically identified the segregated setting as the placement for services. Verification of enrollment data indicated a discrepancy in the total served from total reported served. The child count data had been verified, which was also raised during the OSEP on-site monitoring/verification visit in October 2006.

During the September 2006 FSM-HESA on-site visit, it was noted that in previous years, collaboration between the Special Education Program and the Head Start Program, the educational setting for typically developing preschoolers, was not evident. However, with the merging of the Head Start Program, now known as the Early Childhood Education (ECE) Program, under the Chuuk State School System beginning in 2005, the continuum of placement options for preschoolers with disabilities have been expanded to include the ECE Program.

As a result of the September 2006 FSM-HESA Focused Monitoring Visit, Chuuk State was required to develop a specific plan for addressing the LRE provisions for preschoolers with disabilities. As required, Chuuk State provided its corrective action plan outlining specific policy and procedural changes to ensure appropriate practices are in place following the special education procedures under IDEA. The actions required must demonstrate that preschoolers with disabilities are appropriately identified, referred, evaluated, and served in an environment to meet their needs, including the provision of special education and related services provided in the ECE Program, Chuuk State's educational setting for typically developing preschoolers.

In October 2006, Chuuk State submitted a corrective action plan with the goal to increase the opportunity for preschool children with IEPs to participate in typical early childhood settings with

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

supports provided. As part of the corrective plan, Chuuk State reported that two planning meetings have been held with the Chuuk State Early Childhood Education Program to discuss the process for ensuring a smooth transition from the early childhood special education setting to early childhood settings. IEP meetings have been scheduled for all preschoolers with disabilities. Furthermore, reassignment of staff to the Early Childhood Education Program centers in the communities will occur as part of the transition planning. FSM-HESA will closely monitor Chuuk State's progress through quarterly reports that will provide a status update. In addition, focused technical assistance will be provided through support from University of Guam CEDDERS.

2. Child Find: Findings: Chuuk was also cited as serving students with IEPs in 37 of 98 public schools, indicating that its Child Find system did not extend throughout the state. Chuuk State's student data showed discrepancies in the number served and total number reported served. The implementation of a Child Find system was also raised during the OSEP on-site monitoring/verification visit in October 2006.

Chuuk State's October 2006 corrective action plan included activities to expand services to outer islands by hiring additional teachers and maybe locating services at central outer islands that can be accessed by a group of neighboring outer islands. As noted during FSM-HESA's focused monitoring visit, given the geographic remoteness of many of Chuuk State's island communities, the expansion of the Child Find system must be thoughtful to ensure that appropriate special education and related services are provided for students with disabilities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2005-2006:

No revisions to the improvement activities at this time.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to overview provided on page 1.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children 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:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):
 - a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
 - b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
 - c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
 - d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
 - e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.
- 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 = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
 - b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
 - c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

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 the (# 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 the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator. No Targets required until 2006-2007.

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

New Indicator. Refer to SPP for this Indicator submitted February 1, 2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2005-2006:

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to overview provided on page 1.

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
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator. Refer to SPP submitted February 1, 2007 for baseline.

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

New Indicator. Refer to SPP for this Indicator submitted February 1, 2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2005-2006:

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to overview provided on page 1.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator.

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

New Indicator. Refer to SPP for this Indicator submitted February 1, 2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2005-2006: *[if applicable]*

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to overview provided on page 1.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator.

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

New Indicator. Refer to SPP for this Indicator submitted February 1, 2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2005-2006: [If applicable]

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to overview provided on page 1.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Measurement:

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator.

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

New Indicator. Refer to SPP for this Indicator submitted February 1, 2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2005-2006:

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to overview provided on page 1.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

Measurement:

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Does not apply to FSM.

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

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

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2005-2006:

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to overview provided on page 1.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator.

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

New Indicator. Refer to SPP for this Indicator submitted February 1, 2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2005-2006:

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to overview provided on page 1.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator.

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

New Indicator. Refer to SPP for this Indicator submitted February 1, 2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2005-2006:

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to overview provided on page 1.

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))

<p>Measurement:</p> <p>Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:</p> <p>a. # of findings of noncompliance.</p> <p>b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.</p> <p>For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and enforcement actions that the State has taken.</p>

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects all noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification 100% of the time.

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

The following Table lists the noncompliance areas by FSM State LEA identified in 2004-2005 and in 2005-2006 with performance data, source of findings, actions taken for correction, and the number and percentage of noncompliance corrected as soon as possible but not later than one year from identification.

(a) Findings of Noncompliance	2004-2005 Performance Data	2005-2006 Performance Data	Source of Findings	Actions Taken for Correction	(b) # & % Corrected With Evidence
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE					
1. <u>Chuuk State:</u> Indicator 6: Preschool LRE	Not Identified	Inconsistent implementation of procedures for LRE determination	OSEP SPP Letter, March 2006 Focused Monitoring Report, Sept 2006	▪ Corrective action plan approved as a result of Sept 2006 Monitoring Report	Awaiting progress report; Still within one-year timeframe
Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/Child Find					
2. <u>Chuuk State:</u> Indicator 11: Child Find	Not Identified	38% 37 out of 98 schools with special	Focused Monitoring Report, Sept 2006	▪ Corrective action plan approved as a result of Sept 2006 Monitoring Report	Not Corrected Although still within one-year

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

(a) Findings of Noncompliance	2004-2005 Performance Data	2005-2006 Performance Data	Source of Findings	Actions Taken for Correction	(b) # & % Corrected With Evidence
		education services Inaccurate data for 60-day timeline	2005-2006 LPP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Corrective actions require relocation of personnel and hiring of new staff. New positions (2) reflected in 2006-2007 budget. 	timeframe from Sept 2006 identification, Chuuk reported inaccurate data for 2005-2006, which indicates continued issues with tracking documented evidence of procedural requirements
3. <u>Kosrae State:</u> Indicator 11: Child Find	Not Identified	94% 51/54 completed within 60-day timeline	2005-2006 LPP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No evidence of pending evaluations completed 	Not Corrected
4. <u>Pohnpei State:</u> Indicator 11: Child Find	Not Identified	96% 49/51 completed within 60-day timeline	2005-2006 LPP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of evaluations completed in quarterly report ▪ Evidence of procedures in place for "flagging" timeline 	Correction Made Procedures in place
5. <u>Yap State:</u> Indicator 11: Child Find	Lack of evidence of system in place	100% 2/2 within 60-day timeline	2005-2006 LPP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hosted the August 2006 FSM Parent/Consumer Conference that featured sessions in the community on special education 	Correction Made
Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/Effective Transition					
6. <u>Pohnpei State:</u> Indicator 13: Secondary Goals & Transition Services	Lack of evidence in IEP files reviewed during on-site monitoring Visit, Dec 2004	41% 41 out of 101 files with required documentation	Dec 2004 Monitoring Report 2005-2006 LPP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documented training activities with secondary teachers regarding requirements ▪ Evidence of appropriate documentation in files 	Not Corrected Although not at 100%, LEA demonstrates continued progress with mechanisms in place
7. <u>Yap State:</u> Indicator 13: Secondary Goals & Transition Services	Lack of evidence in IEP files reviewed during on-site monitoring Visit, February 2005	0% 0 out of 21 files with required documentation	February 2005 Monitoring Report 2005-2006 LPP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Secondary Transition teachers hired to address transition requirements. 	Not Corrected
Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/General Supervision					
8. <u>Yap State:</u> LEA Monitoring System	No evidence of local monitoring in place	Quarterly Report documents design for monitoring	February 2005 Monitoring Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Personnel reassignment for effective program supervision 	Correction Made Verification

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

(a) Findings of Noncompliance	2004-2005 Performance Data	2005-2006 Performance Data	Source of Findings	Actions Taken for Correction	(b) # & % Corrected With Evidence
			2005-2006 LPP Personnel listing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revised FSM-HESA <i>Continuous Improvement Monitoring System</i> includes procedures for implementing local monitoring of schools 	through Quarterly Reports; On- site verification scheduled to review evidence of school monitoring reports
Other Topical Areas					
9. <u>Yap State:</u> IEP in Effect	Overdue IEPs	Updated IEPs	February 2005 Monitoring Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Updated IEPs verified through quarterly report 	Correction Made Verification through Quarterly Report
<p style="text-align: center;">% Correction of Noncompliance for an Effective General Supervision System = (b) ÷ (a) x 100 4 Correction Made (Findings #4, 5, 8, and 9) ÷ 8 Total Findings* x 100 = 50%</p>					

*Based on the list of findings of noncompliance in the above Table, #1 related to Chuuk State's preschool services is considered still within the one-year timeframe and therefore not included in the calculation for percentage of correction.

Areas of Noncompliance Not Corrected ASAP, but not later than One Year from Identification

As listed in the Table above, the findings of noncompliance were identified as a result of the FSM-HESA on-site monitoring visits to Pohnpei State and Yap State in 2004-2005, as well as from the data compiled for the 2005-2006 APR/SPP. The following describes consequences provided for those noncompliance findings not corrected within the one-year timeframe:

Chuuk State: Indicator 11: Child Find: FSM-HESA verified procedures for documenting and tracking appropriate procedures in January 2007. Reviews of Chuuk State's Quarterly Progress Reports will be conducted in anticipation of Chuuk State's ability to report accurate data for 2006-2007.

Kosrae State: Indicator 11: Child Find: FSM-HESA issued a notice to Kosrae State regarding monitoring the status of all pending evaluations through Kosrae State's Quarterly Progress Report.

Pohnpei State: Indicator 13: Secondary Goals & Transition Services: As noted, progress has been made toward compliance. FSM-HESA to monitor progress toward full compliance through Pohnpei State's submission of the Quarterly Reports and record reviews during the FSM-HESA on-site monitoring visit scheduled in March 2007.

Yap State: Indicator 13: Secondary Goals & Transition Services: FSM-HESA to conduct an on-site monitoring visit by April 2007 to review this noncompliance area. As a result of the visit, FSM-HESA shall make a "determination" for the consequences required for correction.

Other previously identified areas of noncompliance from the FSM SPP submitted in December 2005 considered "systemic" issues addressed through FSM-HESA prioritized national initiatives included:

- Operational FSM State-Level LEA Complaints and Due Process System: The FSM Complaints, Due Process, and Mediation System procedures were updated incorporating the December 2004 requirements. The FSM National training was initiated with the first part of the mediation and due process training completed November 9-11, 2006 by a conciliation agency out of Guam. Two (2) prospective mediators from Kosrae and 2 from Yap completed training. A second training will

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

continue with the same four during summer 2007. As a result, these four trained mediators will stand as local mediators for the four island states. They will also be used to conduct workshops during special education conferences and meetings, including the annual parent conference scheduled each summer.

The annual FSM-HESA sponsored Parent/Consumer Conference was held in Yap State in August 2006. The conference included sessions on procedural safeguards, IEP development, interagency collaboration, and parent skill development. (refer to FSM SPP Indicator 8 submitted February 1, 2007 for further description and feedback received through the family outcomes survey)

- **Qualified Personnel:** Part of the effort to develop personnel to provide quality services following the established procedures is reflected in three personnel development projects: Related Service Assistant (RSA) trainings, Associate of Arts degree in Special Education, and a Bachelor of Arts in Special Education specialization.
 1. **Related Service Assistant (RSA) Training.** This project is through a Pacific Paraprofessional and Related Services Education Program (PREP) grant project out of the University of Hawaii in partnership with the College of Micronesia-Federated States of Micronesia (COM-FSM). This project is a third-year 30-credit certificate program for special educators to learn skills to support the related services needs of children with low-incidence disabilities in the Pacific. Project year 2005-06 resulted in 16 new RSAs certified. Chuuk-2, Kosrae-3, Pohnpei-9, Yap-2, and 7 from the Republic of the Marshall Islands. All 16 FSM trainees who started completed the one-year 5 training institutes.
 2. **Associate of Arts in Special Education Certification.** This training project is facilitated by COM-FSM. 100 teachers have been targeted to complete this third-year certification training program. The project started Summer 2006 and will end Fall 2008. Teachers completing this degree program will help to improve special education and related services using skills and instructional strategies. Skills will be valuable during the process of identifying and serving children with special needs. Improved services are expected to limit and/or decrease noncompliance occurrences. Number of teachers currently identified: Chuuk-53, Pohnpei-4, and Yap-41.
 3. **Bachelors of Arts in Special Education.** This project is facilitated by San Diego State University (SDSU). This 17 3-unit course (51 credits) program is a blend of the SDSU School of Teacher Education, Department of Special Education, Department of Educational Technology, and the Department of Administration, Rehabilitation and Post Secondary Education, specifically designed to provide special education teachers with a strong foundation in research-based educational philosophy and instructional method. Teachers completing this degree program will also help to improve special education and related services using skills and instructional strategies acquired. Skills will be valuable during the process of identifying and serving children with special needs. Improved services are expected to limit and/or decrease noncompliance occurrences. Sixty-three (63) teachers are enrolled in the project, including: Chuuk-13, Kosrae-26, and Pohnpei-24.
- **Student Data System:** FSM-HESA has developed the web-based FSM Special Education Student Information Tracking System (SITS). This relational student tracking data system will be able to generate reports reflecting LEA status based on data they input at their level. It will allow the SEA to post and make available reportable data to the general public. It will allow for faster data transactions (data aggregation, analysis, and report out) without relying on manual submissions from the FSM States. (refer to Indicator 20 for further discussion)

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

OSEP SPP Letter, March 20, 2006

Table A under "Required Action" of the OSEP SPP Letter dated March 20, 2006 stated that "FSM must include, in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, both baseline data from FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) and progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through July 30, 2006). Failure to include these data may affect OSEP's determination of FSM's status under section 616(d) of IDEA."

Furthermore, OSEP indicated that FSM included some activities, with timelines and resources, but it was unclear to OSEP that FSM would be able to either measure or when the activities were completed, the impact of those activities on compliance, or to determine whether the activities would be sufficient to enable FSM to meet its targets. OSEP noted that "FSM should review its activities to determine if additional activities are needed, or if the activities need to be revised or modified to have the desired effect."

FSM-HESA, the State Education Agency (SEA), assumes the general supervision responsibilities for facilitating the delivery of special education and related services in the four FSM island states through the Education Departments, known as the Local Education Agencies (LEAs): Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap. To meet its general supervision responsibilities, FSM-HESA has a monitoring system, the *Continuous Improvement Monitoring System*, to assess compliance and performance with the IDEA Part B requirements.

In the FSM SPP, FSM-HESA reported conducting an on-site monitoring visit to Pohnpei State and Yap State during the 2004-2005 reporting year. At that time, the monitoring system followed the OSEP Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) cluster areas and IDEA Part B procedural requirements. As noted in the actual data for 2005-2006, performance data and information on corrective actions taken for the identified noncompliance areas were listed for the on-site monitoring visits. Corrections noted were based on evidence provided by the FSM States and verified by FSM-HESA. FSM-HESA on-site monitoring visits to the FSM States were not conducted in 2005-2006 allowing time for revisions to the monitoring procedures and orientation sessions to be completed.

In July 2006, FSM-HESA revised the monitoring system to assess compliance and performance of each LEA based on the IDEA 2004 State Performance Plan (SPP), and FSM Public Law 14-08 of June 2005. FSM Public Law 14-08 provided the amendments to FSM Public Law 8-21 of 1993 ensuring policy alignment with IDEA. The revised system will be utilized during the 2006-2007 monitoring visits to each FSM State. The FSM State LEA Special Education Coordinators and staff have been provided orientation on the monitoring system revisions in preparation for the 2006-2007 FSM-HESA on-site monitoring visits.

As part of the overall general supervision requirements, in July 2006, FSM-HESA required each LEA to submit an annual LEA application for IDEA Part B funding, which includes:

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

The *Continuous Improvement Monitoring System* is designed as an ongoing mechanism for HESA to assess the impact of special education and related services on improving results for children with

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

disabilities in the FSM. Aligned with the compliance and performance requirements of the IDEA State Performance Plan (SPP), the system includes verification and monitoring processes and tools following the twenty IDEA SPP Indicator and measurement requirements. Seventeen (17) of the twenty IDEA SPP indicators are measurement requirements that HESA has to provide annual progress data to OSEP. The three (3) remaining IDEA SPP Indicators (#9, 10, and 12) are not applicable to the FSM and do not require reporting progress data to OSEP. However, two (2) of the three, Indicators 9 and 12, have been revised to address specific HESA requirements based on the FSM National mandate for special education. The system describes the required collection, compilation, analysis, and reporting of data for each IDEA SPP Indicator measurement requirement.

The system methods require specific documentation of evidence demonstrating compliance and performance for each related IDEA SPP Indicator. As an annual cycle of evaluation, the methods are linked together in the review process to evaluate consistency in reporting accurate, valid, and reliable progress data. The methods in the system support the SEA and LEA verification and monitoring reviews, which include: (1) LEA LPP and Quarterly Reports; (2) LEA Reported IDEA 618 Data; (3) SEA On-site monitoring visits; (4) SEA National SPP Meeting; and (5) LEA Monitoring System.

In October 2006, OSEP conducted an on-site verification visit to the FSM. One of the areas reviewed was the effectiveness of FSM's general supervision system. During the visit, FSM-HESA was able to share the July 2006 revisions to the FSM *Continuous Improvement* Monitoring System and provide evidence of previous monitoring reports and FSM State LEA quarterly reports. As mentioned earlier, the previous monitoring reports followed the CIMP Cluster Area framework. With IDEA 2004 and the SPP requirements, FSM-HESA updated the procedures to align with the SPP framework. FSM-HESA is awaiting official notice of OSEP's findings and recommendations for improvement.

In January 2007, the FSM *Continuous Improvement* Monitoring System was updated to include "determination levels" following OSEP's determination levels: Meets requirements, needs assistance, needs intervention, and needs substantial intervention. These levels, with appropriate consequences and sanctions, will be used as a result of an on-site monitoring visit and review of the FSM State annual Local Performance Plan (LPP) beginning 2006-2007.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2005-2006:

With the January 2007 revisions to the *Continuous Improvement* Monitoring System, no revisions to improvement activities recommended at this time. Although FSM's general supervision system was reported at 50% (4/8) for 2005-2006, revisions to the monitoring system were made in July 2006 and January 2007 to meet all IDEA requirements. It is anticipated that the system for identification and correction will be fully implemented in 2006-2007.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to overview provided on page 1.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

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

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2005-2006:

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to overview provided on page 1.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

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

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2005-2006:

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to overview provided on page 1.

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
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator.

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

New Indicator. Refer to SPP for this Indicator submitted February 1, 2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2005-2006:

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to overview provided on page 1.

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
2005 (2005-2006)	Unable to set target. No requests received. As per OSEP's instructions, targets are set with 10 or more mediations as baseline.

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

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

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2005-2006:

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to overview provided on page 1.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Measurement:

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

Actual Target Data for 2005-2006:

Measurement A: Submitted Reports on or before Due Date

The Table below lists the 2005-2006 reporting requirements, due dates, and submission dates. As shown, FSM-HESA met the "timely" requirement for 3 of the 7 reports for the reporting year.

Due Date	Reports	Sent to WESTAT	Sent to OSEP
Dec 2, 2005	FSM SPP	Not Required	E-mailed & Mailed 12/2/2005
Feb 1, 2006	618 Child Count & Placement (12/1/05)	E-mailed 1/31/2006	Mailed 2/2006
Feb 1, 2006	618 Assessment (2004-2005)	Did not submit*	Did not submit*
Nov 1, 2006	618 Personnel, Exiting, Discipline (2005-2006)	1/22/2007	Mailed 2/9/2007

*The first year 618 Table 6 was required. FSM was only able to report "participation" data in the SPP.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Measurement B: Mechanism for Ensuring Accuracy

To account for accuracy for reported data, the following Table lists all required reports and the required data measures for each report:

2005-2006 Submitted Reports/Data (refer to Measurement A for List)	#Reports	Required Data Measures	
		#	Description of Measures
State Performance Plan	1	22	Based on Indicator Targets (NOTE: Indicators 4b, 9, 10, & 12 do not apply to FSM)
618 Assessment	1	2	618 Table 6 (Participation & Proficiency)
618 Child Count & Placement	2	2	618 Tables 1 and 3
618 Personnel, Exiting, & Discipline	3	3	618 Tables 2, 4, & 5
Total # Required Reports	7	29	Total # Data Measures from Accuracy

For Measurement B, Accuracy, FSM-HESA re-submitted 618 data for 2005 Tables 1 and 3 and 2005-2006 Table 4. In addition, FSM-HESA was not able to verify Chuuk State’s data for SPP Indicators 11 and 13, resulting in no data included for Chuuk State. The total number of correction or inaccurate data for Measurement B would then be 5 out of the 29 required data measures. The total “accurate” data measures therefore would be 24 out of the 29.

The overall total percentage for this indicator measurement is calculated from combining Measurement A and Measurement B:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & 3 \text{ (#Timely submitted)} + 24 \text{ (#Accurate)} \\
 & \text{divided by } 36 \text{ (Total Required: } 7+29) \times 100 \\
 & = \underline{\underline{75\% \text{ Performance for 2005-2006}}}
 \end{aligned}$$

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005-2006:

OSEP SPP Letter, March 20, 2006

Tables A & B under “Required Action” of the OSEP SPP Letter dated March 20, 2006 stated that “FSM should reconsider the baseline data for Indicators 1 & 2 of the SPP and provide accurate, updated data and improvement activities in the FFY 2005 APR. In addition, Table B noted that “FSM must ensure that any activities or strategies regarding this Indicator result in the collection of the required baseline data for the required time period, and that the baseline data and any other required data are reported in the APR, due February 1, 2007.”

FSM-HESA Special Education Program continues to work closely with general education to ensure accurate comparison data for Indicators 1 and 2. As reported in the 2005-2006 APR, data compiled was verified between the LEA special education office and the education data office, while efforts were made to integrate all data requirements into the general education data system, the Education Management Information System (EMIS). The EMIS is a Microsoft Access program, similar to the FSM Special Education Student Information Tracking System (SITS). However, with each LEA education data office utilizing the Pacific Education Data Management System (PEDMS), an excel application system, coordination of all data elements required for the U.S. Interior Education Sector Grant continue to be through each LEA submitting data from PEDMS to FSM-HESA for input into the EMIS.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

In the meantime, FSM-HESA Special Education Program continues to collect separately the required data for the 618 Reports and APR, with verification of compiled data at the local level between the LEA special education office and the education data office. Indicators 1 & 2 reported in this APR report accurate data based on a manual review of data collected at each FSM State LEA.

The other issue noted in OSEP's March 2006 SPP Letter for this indicator was from a previously identified issue raised in OSEP's September 22, 2005 letter regarding including a description of how FSM would collect data on the number of children with disabilities identified in the early grades. As shown in the 2005-2006 baseline data for SPP Indicator #11, Child Find, FSM-HESA reported data on the "percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days." Since the performance data for SPP Indicator #11 was considered "baseline" data, improvement activities were identified for Indicator #11 to meet full compliance with the requirement and to monitor the identification rates of children with disabilities in the early grades. The data elements for monitoring performance for Indicator #11 have been incorporated into the SITS. (refer to SPP Indicator #11 for further discussion)

Progress on Data System Development

For data collection and compilation, FSM-HESA notifies each LEA of the 618 data forms and timelines required for completion each year following the OSEP definitions and required timelines for collecting and submitting required data. The LEA is responsible for maintaining the data required for completion of each Table. Each LEA submits completed 618 data reports to the FSM-HESA Special Education Office. The FSM-HESA aggregates the data for each of the four LEAs into a National 618 data report. This data is also used within each LEA Local Performance Plan (LPP), as well as for the FSM SPP/APR. FSM-HESA on-site monitoring visits and LEA submitted quarterly reports are used to verify accuracy of data collected and compiled at the LEA levels.

The FSM-HESA Special Education Program is in the final process of beta-testing and implementing a web-based data system, SITS, which will allow each LEA to maintain their special education data at the LEA level and the FSM-HESA Special Education Program to aggregate the data at the National level via a web-based report generator. This will allow the 618 data tables to be automatically produced, as well as to be able to maintain additional special education data requirements at the National and LEA level. During 2005-2006, Pohnpei State piloted the SITS web-based capacity by inputting all student information and uploading the data into the web-based data system. FSM-HESA Special Education Program verified the aggregated data and information for accuracy with Pohnpei State. Pohnpei State also provided feedback on the technical qualities of the system, including coding and total displays, as well as suggestions for improving the reports generated for local case managers and schools.

During the OSEP monitoring/verification site visit in October 2006, FSM-HESA was able to demonstrate the input and uploading of data conducted at Pohnpei State and the National review of aggregate data at the FSM-HESA Special Education Program Office. Although it was mentioned that the system would be fully operational by December 2006, the other three FSM State LEA Special Education Programs are scheduled to start "uploading" by March 2007. Verification of uploaded data and final training with the LEA data managers is scheduled for March 19-23, 2007. Training will cover the revised 618 Tables and the new Tables 6 (assessment) and 7 (dispute resolution). The intent will be for the data specialists to understand the tables, what data elements to collect and use to fill out each table, to be able to complete each table on paper and pencil, and to also use the SITS. Focus will be given to how they can work with the community schools to collect and report accurate data in a timely fashion, given their respective geographical or other situations.

In addition, the training will cover SITS for two new specialists from Chuuk State and Yap State. The beta version will be finalized with input from the FSM States. FSM States will be able to input actual student records and read reports generated from the database. Reports will be presented to the Division of Education Evaluation and Assessment Unit for review and consideration in the merging of EMIS and SITS. It is important to note that it is understood by both EMIS specialists and SITS specialists that the attempt will be to merge only those data elements that are similar. Special Education has certain required data elements that EMIS is not consistently collecting that Special Education will continue to collect and report.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005-2006

Each FSM State LEA submits quarterly reports that include progress data for the 618 reports and APR, with verification of data done via phone or e-mail. FSM-HESA conducts annual on-site monitoring visits to each FSM State to serve as the physical verification of submitted data. There is also the potential for focused monitoring site visits, as done with Chuuk State in September 2006, which target verification of specific data and program services. As shared during the October 2006 OSEP Monitoring/Verification on-site visit, some of the challenges in creating and implementing a fully operational data system stem from the geographic distance between FSM-HESA and the FSM State LEAs for immediate verification of data inputted with reports submitted. In addition, some of the data requirements, such as collection of suspension and expulsion data and graduation data have required the FSM-HESA Special Education Program to work closely with the general education data system. In the overall FSM-HESA, there are many areas where data is not consistently being collected. The August 2006 FSM JEMCO 20 Education Indicators Report for school year 2005-2006 reflected the inaccuracies and inconsistencies in reporting FSM State data.

To address the challenges of ensuring timely and accurate data, the FSM-HESA Special Education Program has worked to create partnerships with general education data collection efforts to expand and improve the existing data collection system such that special education can receive the data necessary for completing the 618 data reports and APR. Special Education is working with the general education data staff to insure that the new EMIS data system for general education also includes the data elements that special education needs to report for 618 and APR data.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2005-2006:

Given that SITS is anticipated to be fully operational in 2006-2007, a review of progress will be conducted at the end of the 2006-2007 reporting year to determine if additional improvement activities will be needed to support this compliance Indicator in subsequent years.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE ASSESSMENTS

DATE: January 29, 2007

STATUS: ORIGINAL SUBMISSION

Data are due February 1, 2007.

Please read the following basic guidelines before completing the Data Transmission System (DTS) forms:

1. To change the size and appearance of the text on the spreadsheet, select VIEW from the toolbar, select ZOOM, and then select the percentage increase or decrease.
2. Enter the appropriate data into the YELLOW shaded areas on each page of the form. Please be sure to read section heading descriptions so data are entered in the correct section. Also, be sure to enter any State and date information. The two-digit State postal code should appear on every page of the form. A list is available on PAGE1. Use the scroll bar or the up or down arrow keys to scroll through the list. Click on the appropriate State postal code to select it.
3. If you choose to cut and paste data from another area, use the PASTE SPECIAL option and select VALUES. This will protect the current formats.
4. Any comments regarding the submitted data should be entered on the last page of the workbook, titled COMMENTS.
5. Save the completed forms. Please be sure that your State postal code appears in the file name. (Example: Maryland - AS05MD.XLS)
6. Red cells indicate a condition that must hold. Orange cells indicate a condition that should hold. **Please make sure there are NO RED CELLS before saving and submitting data.**
7. Print the entire workbook by selecting, FILE, PRINT and then select ENTIRE WORKBOOK located in the 'PRINT WHAT' section. Send printed copies of the completed DTS forms to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) at the following address:

Alexa Posney, Director
Office of Special Education Programs
U.S. Department of Education
Part B Data Reports
Program Support Services Group
Mail Stop 2600
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20202-2600
Attn: Cheryl Broady

8. If you received your file by e-mail, please return electronic copies of completed DTS forms to Danielle Crain at Westat

Daniellecrain@WESTAT.COM

Westat

1650 Research Blvd

RA 1205

Rockville, MD 20850-3159

9. If you have any questions or comments, please contact Danielle Crain at (301) 610-8805

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

2005-2006

STATE: **FM - MICRONESIA**

SECTION A. ENROLLMENT DATA FOR THE MATH ASSESSMENT¹

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH IEPs (1)	ALL STUDENTS (2)
3	0	0
4	0	0
5	0	0
6	135	1741
7	0	0
8	120	1607
HIGH SCHOOL (SPECIFY GRADE:) 10	57	809

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

2005-2006

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

SECTION B. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS			
	TOTAL (3)	SUBSET (OF 3) WHO TOOK THE ASSESSMENT WITH ACCOMODATIONS (3A)	SUBSET (OF 3) WITH CHANGES TO THE ASSESSMENT THAT INVALIDATED THEIR SCORE ¹ (3B)	SUBSET (OF 3) WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ² (3C)
3	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0
6	45	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0
8	58	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	19	0	0	0

¹ Changes to the assessment that invalidate a score are changes in testing materials or procedures that enable a student to participate in the assessment, but result in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students without these changes. In some States these changes are called modifications or nonstandard administrations.

² Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problems in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of the assessment or students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly).

CURRENT DATE:

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

2005-2006

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

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK OUT OF GRADE LEVEL ASSESSMENT		
	TOTAL (4)	SUBSET (OF 4) WITH CHANGES TO THE ASSESSMENT THAT INVALIDATED THEIR SCORE ¹ (4A)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ² (4B)
3	0	0	0
4	0	0	0
5	0	0	0
6	0	0	0
7	0	0	0
8	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	0	0	0

¹ Changes to the assessment that invalidate a score are changes in testing materials or procedures that enable a student to participate in the assessment, but result in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students without these changes. In some States these changes are called modifications or nonstandard administrations.

² Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problems in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of the assessment or students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly).

CURRENT DATE:

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

2005-2006

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

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

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT				
	TOTAL (5)	SUBSET (OF 5) WHOSE ALTERNATE WAS SCORED AGAINST GRADE LEVEL STANDARDS (5A)	SUBSET (OF 5) WHOSE ALTERNATE WAS SCORED AGAINST ALTERNATE ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (5B)	SUBSET (OF 5B) COUNTED AT THE LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL BECAUSE OF THE NCLB CAP ³ (5C)	SUBSET (OF 5) WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ⁴ (5D)
3	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL :	10	0	0	0	0

³ NCLB cap is the limit on the percent of students whose scores can be held to alternate achievement standards in AYP calculations.

⁴ Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problems in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of the assessment or students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly).

CURRENT DATE:

TABLE 6

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

2005-2006

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

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

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE ANY ASSESSMENT		
	PARENTAL EXEMPTION (6)	ABSENT (7)	EXEMPT FOR OTHER REASONS ⁵ (8)
3	0	0	0
4	0	0	0
5	0	0	0
6	0	0	90
7	0	0	0
8	0	0	62
HIGH SCHOOL :	10	0	38

⁵ Provide a list of other reasons for exemption with the number of students exempted by each grade and reason for exemption.

Please provide the reason(s) for exemption.

CURRENT DATE:

2005-2006

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT

REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL (9A)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	NP	SIN	MASTERY							9A ROW TOTAL ²
		Achievement Level ¹	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	
3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	FSM NST	39	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	FSM NST	56	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	FSM NST	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: SIN

¹ Include all students whose regular assessment score was in the lowest achievement level plus all students who received a score but changes to the assessment invalidated their score (column 3B).

² The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9A is to equal the number reported in column 3 minus the number reported in columns 3C.

CURRENT DATE:

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

2005-2006

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

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

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL STANDARDS (9B)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Achievement Level ¹	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	9B ROW TOTAL ²
3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:

¹ Include all students whose score on the alternate assessment on grade level standards was in the lowest achievement level plus all students who received a score but changes to the assessment invalidated their score.

² The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9B is to equal the number reported in column 5A minus that portion of 5F that includes students whose assessment scored on grade level standards was invalid.

CURRENT DATE:

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

2005-2006

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

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

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT SCORED AGAINST ALTERNATE STANDARDS (9C)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Achievement Level ¹	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	9C ROW TOTAL ²
		3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:

¹ Include all students whose assessment counted in the lowest achievement level because of the NCLB 1% cap plus all students who received a score but changes to the assessment invalidated their score. If your state has an approved exception to the 1% cap, as indicated in Section A, use your adjusted cap rather than 1% when determining the number of students that must be the lowest achievement level.

² The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9D is to equal the number reported in column 4 plus the number reported in column 5D minus the number reported in columns 4B and that portion of 5F that includes students whose alternate assessment scored on alternate standard was invalid.

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

2005-2006

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

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

GRADE LEVEL	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9A (ON PAGE 6) ¹	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9B (ON PAGE 7)	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9C (ON PAGE 8)	NO VALID SCORE ⁷ (10)	TOTAL ⁸ (11)
3	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0
6	45	0	0	90	135
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	58	0	0	62	120
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	19	0	0	38	57

⁷ The number of students reported in column 10 is to equal the number reported in column 3C plus column 4B plus column 5D plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8.

⁸ The number of students reported in column 11, the row total, should equal the number of students with IEPs reported in Section A.

CURRENT DATE:

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

2005-2006

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

SECTION D. ENROLLMENT DATA FOR THE READING ASSESSMENT¹

GRADE LEVEL		STUDENTS WITH IEPs (1)	ALL STUDENTS (2)
3		0	0
4		0	0
5		0	0
6		137	1741
7		0	0
8		119	1607
HIGH SCHOOL (SPECIFY GRADE:)	10	57	809

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

2005-2006

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS			
	TOTAL (3)	SUBSET (OF 3) WHO TOOK THE ASSESSMENT WITH ACCOMODATIONS (3A)	SUBSET (OF 3) WITH CHANGES TO THE ASSESSMENT THAT INVALIDATED THEIR SCORE ¹ (3B)	SUBSET (OF 3) WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ² (3C)
3	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0
6	52	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0
8	51	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	26	0	0	0

¹ Changes to the assessment that invalidate a score are changes in testing materials or procedures that enable a student to participate in the assessment, but result in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students without these changes. In some States these changes are called modifications or nonstandard administrations.

² Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problems in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of the assessment or students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly).

CURRENT DATE:

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

2005-2006

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

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

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK OUT OF GRADE LEVEL ASSESSMENT		
	TOTAL (4)	SUBSET (OF 4) WITH CHANGES TO THE ASSESSMENT THAT INVALIDATED THEIR SCORE ¹ (4A)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ² (4B)
3	0	0	0
4	0	0	0
5	0	0	0
6	0	0	0
7	0	0	0
8	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	0	0	0

¹ Changes to the assessment that invalidate a score are changes in testing materials or procedures that enable a student to participate in the assessment, but result in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students without these changes. In some States these changes are called modifications or nonstandard administrations.

² Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problems in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of the assessment or students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly).

CURRENT DATE:

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

2005-2006

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

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

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT				
	TOTAL (5)	SUBSET (OF 5) WHOSE ALTERNATE WAS SCORED AGAINST GRADE LEVEL STANDARDS (5A)	SUBSET (OF 5) WHOSE ALTERNATE WAS SCORED AGAINST ALTERNATIVE ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (5B)	SUBSET (OF 5B) COUNTED AT THE LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL BECAUSE OF THE NCLB CAP ³ (5C)	SUBSET (OF 5) WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID ⁴ (5D)
3	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	0	0	0	0	0

³ NCLB cap is the limit on the percent of students whose scores can be held to alternate achievement standards in AYP calculations.

⁴ Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and or aggregation due to problems in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of the assessment or students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly).

CURRENT DATE:

TABLE 6

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

2005-2006

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

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

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE ANY ASSESSMENT		
	PARENTAL EXEMPTION (6)	ABSENT (7)	EXEMPT FOR OTHER REASONS ⁵ (8)
3	0	0	0
4	0	0	0
5	0	0	0
6	0	0	85
7	0	0	0
8	0	0	68
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	0	0	31

⁵ Provide a list of other reasons for exemption with the number of students exempted by each grade and reason for exemption.

CURRENT DATE:

2005-2006

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT

REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL (9A)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	NP	SIN	MASTERY							9A ROW TOTAL ²
		Achievement Level ¹	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	
3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	FSM NST	44	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	FSM NST	45	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	FSM NST	17	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: SIN

¹ Include all students whose regular assessment score was in the lowest achievement level plus all students who received a score but changes to the assessment invalidated their score (column 3B).

² The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9A is to equal the number reported in column 3 minus the number reported in columns 3C.

CURRENT DATE:

2005-2006

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

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL STANDARDS (9B)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Achievement Level ¹	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	9B ROW TOTAL ²
		3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:

¹ Include all students whose score on the alternate assessment on grade level standards was in the lowest achievement level plus all students who received a score but changes to the assessment invalidated their score.

² The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9B is to equal the number reported in column 5A minus that portion of 5F that includes students whose assessment scored on grade level standards was invalid.

CURRENT DATE:

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

2005-2006

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

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

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT SCORED AGAINST ALTERNATE STANDARDS (9C)											
GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	Achievement Level ¹	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	9C ROW TOTAL ²
3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:

¹ Include all students whose assessment counted in the lowest achievement level because of the NCLB 1% cap plus all students who received a score but changes to the assessment invalidated their score.
 If your state has an approved exception to the 1% cap, as indicated in Section A, use your adjusted cap rather than 1% when determining the number of students that must be the lowest achievement level.

² The total number of students reported by achievement level in 9D is to equal the number reported in column 4 plus the number reported in column 5D minus the number reported in columns 4B and that portion of 5F that includes students whose alternate assessment scored on alternate standard was invalid.

2005-2006

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

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

GRADE LEVEL	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9A (ON PAGE 15)	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9B (ON PAGE 16)	TOTAL FOR COLUMN 9C (ON PAGE 17)	NO VALID SCORE ⁷ (10)	TOTAL ⁸ (11)
3	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0
6	52	0	0	85	137
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	51	0	0	68	119
HIGH SCHOOL : 10	26	0	0	31	57

⁷ The number of students reported in column 10 is to equal the number reported in column 3C plus column 4B plus column 5D plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8.

⁸ The number of students reported in column 11, the row total, should equal the number of students with IEPs reported in Section A.

CURRENT DATE:

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

STATE: FM - MICRONESIA

COMMENTS

Test components for grade levels 6, 8, and 10 contain 63 total items in both Language Arts and Math. Breakdown of performance levels is as follows:

NP=Not Proficient

0-37 items answered correctly

SIN=Significant Improvement Needed

38-50 items answered correctly

MASTERY

51-63 items answered correctly

CURRENT DATE:

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

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

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

SECTION D: Expedited hearing requests (related to disciplinary decision)	
(4) Expedited hearing requests total	0
(4.1) Resolution sessions	0
(a) Settlement agreements	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated)	0
(a) Change of placement ordered	0