

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan 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). As the SEA, FSM-HESA facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input in the development of the FSM Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) Part B State Performance Plan (SPP). In addition, FSM-HESA, with stakeholder input, developed a dissemination plan for distributing the FSM IDEA Part B SPP. FSM-HESA contracted with the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS) to facilitate the SPP orientation and input sessions for the SPP development.

As instructed by the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), at minimum, each entity is required to involve the State Advisory Panel in the development of the SPP. In the FSM, the advisory panel for special education has been incorporated into the LEA's Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) Steering Committee comprised of a broader group to include interagency council members and additional members from the island community's parent organization. Each LEA Steering Committee Chairperson, who is a parent of a child with a disability, the LEA special education coordinator, and the FSM-HESA Special Education Program staff make up the FSM National Steering Committee. As described in previous FSM Annual Performance Reports, the FSM National Steering Committee convenes annually to review issues and priorities of each LEA and to develop FSM-HESA National priorities that respond to individual and collective LEA issues related to the delivery of special education and related services for children and youth with disabilities and their families.

FSM-HESA therefore meets the minimum requirement for "broad stakeholder input" by involving the FSM National Steering Committee, as well as the LEA Steering Committees representing the State Advisory Panel. In addition, participation in the FSM National Steering Committee meetings included FSM-HESA and LEA general education administrators to ensure the involvement of key general educators for the required comparison data. FSM-HESA engaged in a process to ensure that input from each LEA Steering Committee would be brought to the FSM National Steering Committee for consideration and incorporation into the FSM IDEA Part B SPP. Orientation sessions were held at the National and LEA levels to allow for participating stakeholders to review the SPP requirements, understand the alignment of the SPP with previous reporting requirements, and review critical FSM 2004-2005 data for inclusion into the SPP. The input sessions provided an opportunity for FSM National and LEA Steering Committees to review the draft SPP that included a description of the system, baseline data, and discussion of baseline data for each indicator. This review then led to the stakeholders offering recommendations for annual targets for FSM determined SPP indicators, as well as suggestions for designing a process for gathering relevant data and improvement activities for required SPP indicators.

BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT

Orientation Sessions:

FSM National Steering Committee Meeting Participants and Process

FSM-HESA facilitated a two-day orientation session on September 29 & 30, 2005 for the FSM National Steering Committee and other FSM-HESA (also known as the State Education Agency, SEA) and LEA representatives, including general education administrators/specialists. With FSM-HESA staff, all four LEAs were represented for a total of 18 stakeholders participating in the session: 3 (17%) parents/consumers (LEA Steering Committee Chairpersons/Vice Chairperson); 7 (39%) LEA special education coordinators and staff; 4 (22%) LEA general education administrators; and 4 (22%) FSM-HESA (SEA) Special Education Program staff and the Division of Education Assessment & Evaluation Specialist. As a result of reviewing the SPP requirements and critical FSM 2004-2005 baseline data needed, an agreement was reached on the FSM engagement process for ensuring logistical and resource support for LEA orientation sessions. An orientation presentation packet, that

included powerpoint slides with presentation notes and handouts for duplication, was provided to each LEA special education coordinator/Steering Committee Chairperson to facilitate a similar orientation session with the LEA Steering Committee.

Local Education Agency (LEA) Steering Committee Meeting Participants and Process

Chuuk

The Chuuk LEA Steering Committee requested that the orientation session be scheduled right before the input session. (Refer to description under "Input Session")

Kosrae

On October 18, 2005, Kosrae Department of Education, the Local Education Agency (LEA), in collaboration with the LEA Steering Committee, held a Steering Committee Meeting with 21 members and other school personnel: 2 (10%) representing parents, to include the Chairperson for the Kosrae LEA Steering Committee; 13 (61%) special education staff; 5 (24%) general education administrators/specialists; and 1 (5%) representing Health Services. The meeting included an overview of the SPP and FSM's engagement process for meeting the December 2, 2005 deadline for submitting FSM's IDEA Part B SPP to OSEP.

Pohnpei

The Pohnpei LEA Steering Committee requested that the orientation session be scheduled right before the input session. (Refer to description under "Input Session")

Yap

The Yap LEA Steering Committee requested that the orientation session be scheduled right before the input session. (Refer to description under "Input Session")

Input Sessions:

FSM National Steering Committee Meeting Participants and Process

FSM-HESA facilitated the FSM National Steering Committee Meeting on November 3, 4, & 7, 2005. Designed as an input session, 21 stakeholders from the September National Orientation session and other stakeholders from the LEAs participated in the three-day meeting: 3 (14%) parent/consumers (LEA Steering Committee Chairpersons/Vice Chairperson; 8 (38%) LEA special education coordinators and staff; 5 (24%) LEA general education administrators; and 5 (24%) FSM-HESA Special Education Program staff and other National general education administrators, to include the FSM-HESA Assistant Secretary for Education and the President of the College of Micronesia (COM-FSM). The stakeholders reviewed the draft FSM IDEA Part B SPP that included the overview of the system, 2004-2005 baseline data, and baseline discussion sections for each indicator. In addition, improvement activities were listed for each indicator. As a result, recommendations for FSM-Determined targets and improvement strategies to meet the targets were gathered based on the discussion of current and trend data. It was agreed that the recommended FSM-Determined targets and improvement strategies, which included suggestions for gathering baseline data for new indicators, would be presented to each LEA Steering Committee by the participating LEA representatives. The purpose for the LEA Steering Committee presentations was to ensure understanding of the recommendations and to provide an opportunity for additional comments and suggestions. An input presentation packet, that included powerpoint slides with presentation notes and original handouts for duplication, was provided to each LEA special education coordinator/Steering Committee Chairperson to facilitate the presentation and final input opportunity with the LEA Steering Committee.

Local Education Agency (LEA) Steering Committee Meeting Participants and Process

Chuuk

On November 25, 2005, Chuuk State School System, the Local Education Agency (LEA), in collaboration with the LEA Steering Committee, held a Steering Committee Meeting with 16 members

and other school personnel: 6 (38%) representing parents and consumers, to include the Chairperson for the Chuuk LEA Steering Committee; 5 (31%) special education staff; 4 (25%) general education administrators/specialists; and 1 (6%) physician from Health Services. As agreed, this meeting served as an orientation and input session for the FSM IDEA Part B SPP. Participants were provided with an overview of the SPP requirements and spent most of the time reviewing the draft FSM IDEA Part B SPP prepared by FSM-HESA Special Education Program that incorporated input from the FSM National Steering Committee Meeting held in early November 2005. The Chuuk LEA Steering Committee reviewed the recommended FSM-Determined targets for the required SPP indicators based on the baseline data and discussion sections, proposed design for gathering baseline data for required indicators, discussion of baseline data for related compliance indicators, and listed improvement activities for required indicators. As a result, the committee requested additional information regarding the relationship between the SPP and the CIMP engagement, but was in agreement with the Plan. The committee therefore endorsed the draft Plan.

Kosrae

On November 24, 2005, Kosrae Department of Education, the Local Education Agency (LEA), in collaboration with the LEA Steering Committee, held a Steering Committee Meeting with 20 members and other school personnel: 6 (30%) representing parents, to include the Chairperson for the Kosrae LEA Steering Committee; 10 (50%) special education staff; and 4 (20%) general education administrators/specialists. During the meeting, participants reviewed the draft FSM IDEA Part B SPP prepared by FSM-HESA Special Education Program that incorporated input from the FSM National Steering Committee Meeting held in early November 2005. The Kosrae LEA Steering Committee reviewed the recommended FSM-Determined targets for the required SPP indicators based on the baseline data and discussion sections, proposed design for gathering baseline data for required indicators, discussion of baseline data for related compliance indicators, and listed improvement activities for required indicators. As a result, the committee provided input to FSM-HESA related to typographical corrections in certain sections of the draft Plan. The committee further expressed concurrence with and endorsement of the draft Plan.

Pohnpei

On November 25, 2005, Pohnpei Department of Education, the Local Education Agency (LEA), in collaboration with the LEA Steering Committee, held a Steering Committee Meeting with 15 members and other school personnel: 5 (34%) representing parents, to include the Chairperson for the Pohnpei LEA Steering Committee; 8 (53%) special education staff; and 2 (13%) general education administrators/specialists. As agreed, this meeting served as an orientation and input session for the FSM IDEA Part B SPP. Participants were provided with an overview of the SPP requirements and spent most of the time reviewing the draft FSM IDEA Part B SPP prepared by FSM-HESA Special Education Program that incorporated input from the FSM National Steering Committee Meeting held in early November 2005. The Pohnpei LEA Steering Committee reviewed the recommended FSM-Determined targets for the required SPP indicators based on the baseline data and discussion sections, proposed design for gathering baseline data for required indicators, discussion of baseline data for related compliance indicators, and listed improvement activities for required indicators. As a result, the committee provided input to FSM-HESA related to inserting additional baseline discussion for Indicators 1 and 2. The committee further expressed concurrence with and endorsement of the draft Plan.

Yap

On November 25, 2005, Yap Department of Education, the Local Education Agency (LEA), in collaboration with the LEA Steering Committee, held a Steering Committee Meeting with 12 members and other school personnel: 5 (42%) representing parents/consumers, to include the Vice-Chairperson for the Yap LEA Steering Committee; 5 (42%) special education staff; and 2 (16%) general education administrators/specialists. As agreed, this meeting served as an orientation and input session for the FSM IDEA Part B SPP. Participants were provided with an overview of the SPP requirements and spent most of the time reviewing the draft FSM IDEA Part B SPP prepared by FSM-HESA Special Education Program that incorporated input from the FSM National Steering Committee Meeting held in early November 2005. The Yap LEA Steering Committee reviewed the

recommended FSM-Determined targets for the required SPP indicators based on the baseline data and discussion sections, proposed design for gathering baseline data for required indicators, discussion of baseline data for related compliance indicators, and listed improvement activities for required indicators. As a result, the committee agreed with and endorsed the draft Plan.

PUBLIC DISSEMINATION

With stakeholder input, FSM-HESA has designed a distribution plan to meet the SPP public dissemination requirement. The FSM IDEA Part B SPP will be disseminated utilizing the following process and timelines:

1. By December 9, 2005, the FSM IDEA Part B SPP will be posted on the FSM National Government Website: www.fsmgov.org. 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 and the availability of the full plan.
2. By December 9, 2005, 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. The letter will provide an explanation of the purpose for the SPP, availability of the FSM IDEA Part B SPP on the FSM National Government website, and LEA contact information for obtaining a full copy of the plan.
3. By December 9, 2005, the FSM IDEA Part B SPP will be distributed by the FSM-HESA Secretary via the LEA Directors of Education to all LEA Steering Committee members and the following public agencies and other organizations in the four island states: Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap:
 - 3.1 FSM State Governors
 - 3.2 Committee on Education, FSM State Legislatures
 - 3.3 Department of Health Services, which includes the Maternal and Child Health Program (MCH), Mental Health Services, and the Hospital
 - 3.4 Department of Public Safety
 - 3.5 Department of Justice
 - 3.6 FSM State Boards of Education
 - 3.7 Parent Organization
 - 3.8 Chamber of Commerce
 - 3.9 FSM Association for Chief State School Officers (FACSSO)
4. By December 16, 2005, a summary of the FSM IDEA Part B SPP with contact information for obtaining a full copy of the plan will be included in the local newspapers and aired in the local radio stations, as appropriate.
5. Upon receipt of the official notice of OSEP's approval of the FSM IDEA Part B SPP, FSM-HESA to facilitate notice of the approval with each LEA via a posting on the FSM National Government Website, memorandum to the President of FSM and Secretaries of other National Government agencies, and FSM-HESA Deputy Secretary and Assistant Secretaries for Health and Education, memorandum to local public agencies and organizations (as listed in #3), advertisement in the local newspapers, and announcements on the local radio stations.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

As reported in the 2003 FSM Self Assessment Report, FSM-HESA has had difficulty with implementing a data system to accurately compile and report graduation data for comparing students with disabilities to students without disabilities. Public high schools do not consistently report graduation data.

Given the issues related to general education comparison data and the overall lack of consistent collection, compilation, and reporting of information for all students, during school year 2005-2006, FSM-HESA is implementing specific procedures for gathering consistent and accurate graduation data to calculate graduation rates. Through the U.S. Compact II provisions for 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.

With the implementation of the EMIS, FSM-HESA Special Education Program staff are working with the FSM-HESA Evaluation Specialist responsible for the EMIS to review the SPP requirements for comparison data for ensuring inclusion of consistent and accurate graduation data by the Local Education Agency (LEA) in Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The Table below displays the FSM (National) total numbers and percentages for graduation data for school year 2004-2005 utilizing the senior enrollment calculation method for reporting graduation percentages of each LEA.

School Year	% Youth with and without IEPs Graduating with a Diploma in FSM					
	Youth without IEPs			Youth with IEPs		
	#Seniors	#Graduates	%Graduated	#Seniors	#Graduates	%Graduated
2004-2005	1463	1356	93%	45	32	71%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

As noted in previous Annual Performance Reports (APRs), consistent reporting of graduation data has not been available in the four LEAs. The summary Table below displays reported percentages by LEAs, with only two of the four LEAs reporting percentages for the two APR reporting periods:

Reporting Period	% of Graduates with and without Disabilities							
	Chuuk		Kosrae		Pohnpei		Yap	
	Without Disabilities	With Disabilities	Without Disabilities	With Disabilities	Without Disabilities	With Disabilities	Without Disabilities	With Disabilities
2002-2003	92%	N/A	N/A	N/A	93%	100%	90%	100%
2003-2004	N/A	N/A	100%	82%	100%	100%	100%	100%

N/A = Data Not Available

For school year 2004-2005, the FSM national data included LEA reported information on graduation for all four LEAs. All LEAs defined graduation to mean satisfactory completion of high school course credits: Chuuk = 22 credits;

Kosrae = 18 credits (10th-12th grades); Pohnpei = 23 credits; and Yap = 20 credits. Kosrae accounted for credits in 10th – 12th grades, as compared to the other LEAs that included 9th – 12th grade credits for graduation. The calculation for graduation percentages utilized for this reporting period was based on senior enrollment and number of graduates at the end of the school year. The senior enrollment definition differed from LEA to LEA. Both Chuuk and Yap reported that the senior enrollment number was taken at the beginning of the school year. However, both LEAs were not able to report the actual date used as the official enrollment period. For Pohnpei and Kosrae, senior enrollment was updated throughout the year with the official enrollment period being the time of the requested report.

For youth with IEPs, the number of graduates with disabilities was consistent with the 618 reported “graduating with a diploma” data for 2004-2005. However, the LEA reported senior enrollment for youth with IEPs raised issues regarding the consistency in “grade” assignment for youth with IEPs. Participating stakeholders during the FSM National input session in November 2005, especially from Chuuk and Pohnpei, shared that the senior enrollment for youth with IEPs appear to be low considering the number of youth with disabilities, ages 17-21, reported in the 618 Child Count data for December 1st of that school year.

This reporting year represented the first year that FSM-HESA has been able to report numbers and percentages for each LEA: Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap. This can be attributed to the collaborative work initiated between general education and special education to review how youth with disabilities are accounted for within the overall education system. As noted earlier, however, there was not consistent reporting for graduation data from LEA to LEA, which raised concerns regarding the comparison ability of FSM for this reporting period.

A breakdown of the 2004-2005 LEA reported graduation data revealed that the graduation percentage for youth without disabilities was higher than the reported percentage for youth with IEPs, with the difference ranging from an 8% difference for Yap to a 36% difference for Chuuk. The Tables below display the graduation data for each LEA:

CHUUK:

School Year	% Youth with and without IEPs Graduating with a Diploma in Chuuk					
	Youth without IEPs			Youth with IEPs		
	#Seniors	#Graduates	%Graduated	#Seniors	#Graduates	%Graduated
2004-2005	540	467	86%	8	4	50%

KOSRAE:

School Year	% Youth with and without IEPs Graduating with a Diploma in Kosrae					
	Youth without IEPs			Youth with IEPs		
	#Seniors	#Graduates	%Graduated	#Seniors	#Graduates	%Graduated
2004-2005	198	190	96%	19	13	68%

POHNPEI:

School Year	% Youth with and without IEPs Graduating with a Diploma in Pohnpei					
	Youth without IEPs			Youth with IEPs		
	#Seniors	#Graduates	%Graduated	#Seniors	#Graduates	%Graduated
2004-2005	524	505	96%	9	7	78%

YAP:

School Year	% Youth with and without IEPs Graduating with a Diploma in Yap					
	Youth without IEPs			Youth with IEPs		
	#Seniors	#Graduates	%Graduated	#Seniors	#Graduates	%Graduated
2004-2005	201	194	97%	9	8	89%

Although concerns were raised regarding the LEA reported data for senior enrollment numbers for 2004-2005, with stakeholder input, it was agreed that school year 2004-2005 represented the first year FSM-HESA was able to report data for all four states. Therefore, the reported percentages represent FSM’s baseline data. The annual targets established take into consideration the policy and procedural development and implementation needed between general education and special education, especially with the implementation of FSM-HESA’s overall Education

Management Information System (EMIS). There has been some discussion within general education regarding utilizing the “cohort” method for calculating graduation rates. As required for this indicator, FSM-HESA ensures that the calculation utilized for youth with IEPs will be the same as for all youths when determining graduation rates.

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 youth without disabilities in the FSM graduating with a regular diploma.
2006 (2006-2007)	75% of youth with IEPs will have graduated from high school with a regular diploma, which represents working towards being comparable to the percent of youth without disabilities in the FSM graduating with a regular diploma.
2007 (2007-2008)	76% of youth with IEPs will have graduated from high school with a regular diploma, which represents working towards being comparable to the percent of youth without disabilities in the FSM graduating with a regular diploma.
2008 (2008-2009)	77% of youth with IEPs will have graduated from high school with a regular diploma, which represents working towards being comparable to the percent of youth without disabilities in the FSM graduating with a regular diploma.
2009 (2009-2010)	79% of youth with IEPs will have graduated from high school with a regular diploma, which represents working towards being comparable to the percent of youth without disabilities in the FSM graduating with a regular diploma.
2010 (2010-2011)	81% of youth with IEPs will have graduated from high school with a regular diploma, which represents working towards being comparable to the percent of youth without disabilities in the FSM graduating with a regular diploma.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

1. During school year 2005-2006, FSM-HESA to ensure consistency in “graduation with a diploma” definition, to include a review of the number of required credits, and procedures for grade assignments for enrollment data, in all LEAs for graduates with and without disabilities.
 - 1.1 Timeline: School year 2005-2006.
 - 1.2 Resources: Evaluation Specialist for EMIS.

2. Beginning school year 2005-2006, interface SPP graduation 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 graduation data (exit data for special education).
 - 2.1 Timeline: Full implementation in 2005-2006 with annual upgrades and verification of accuracy in data collected through the LEA quarterly reports and annual FSM-HESA monitoring/verification visits.
 - 2.2 Resources: Technical support from appropriate Institution of Higher Education (IHE) or other technical assistance provider for data system upgrades; FSM-HESA Evaluation Specialist for EMIS implementation.

3. Continue monitoring the collection of graduation comparison data through the LEA quarterly reports to FSM-HESA and the FSM-HESA on-site monitoring/verification visits, as scheduled during the school year.
 - 3.1 Timeline: Quarterly for LEA reports. Annually for monitoring/verification visits, with report findings disseminated to all LEAs. Analysis of the reports will assist FSM-HESA with prioritizing nation-wide targeted improvement activities for subsequent years.
 - 3.2 Resource: Technical support from appropriate IHE or technical assistance provider.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to description before Indicator 1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

As reported in the 2003 FSM Self Assessment Report, FSM-HESA has had difficulty with implementing a data system to accurately compile and report drop-out data for comparing students with disabilities to students without disabilities. Public high schools do not consistently report drop-out data.

Given the issues related to general education comparison data and the overall lack of consistent collection, compilation, and reporting information for all students, during school year 2005-2006, FSM-HESA is implementing specific procedures for gathering consistent and accurate drop-out data to calculate drop-out rates. Through the U.S. Compact II provisions for 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 data.

With the implementation of the EMIS, FSM-HESA Special Education Program staff are working with the FSM-HESA Evaluation Specialist responsible for the EMIS to review the SPP requirements for comparison data for ensuring inclusion of consistent and accurate drop-out data by the Local Education Agency (LEA) in Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

For school year 2004-2005, the FSM national data includes LEA reported information on drop-outs for 9th-12th graders without disabilities. For students with disabilities, the 618 reported child count for youth ages 14-21 and exit data for drop-outs were used to create the percentages. The Table below displays the FSM National numbers and percentages for drop-out data.

School Year	% Youth with and without IEPs who Dropped Out in FSM					
	Youth without IEPs			Youth with IEPs		
	#9-12 th graders	#Drop-Outs	%Drop-Outs	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop-Outs	%Drop-Outs
2004-2005	7,298	603	8%	852	28	3%*

*Chuuk State reported only the number of drop-outs from 12th grade.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

As noted in previous Annual Performance Reports (APRs), consistent reporting of drop-out data has not been available in the four LEAs. The summary Table below displays reported percentages by LEAs, with three of the four LEAs reporting relevant data for the 2003-2004 APR reporting period:

Reporting Period	% of Dropouts with and without Disabilities							
	Chuuk		Kosrae		Pohnpei		Yap	
	Without Disabilities	With Disabilities	Without Disabilities	With Disabilities	Without Disabilities	With Disabilities	Without Disabilities	With Disabilities
2002-2003	8%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	18%	1%
2003-2004	N/A	N/A	1%	18%	11%	2%	4%	3%

N/A = Data Not Available

Similarly noted in Indicator 1 regarding senior enrollment, there may be inconsistencies in LEA reported high school “grade” assignments for the enrollment of youth with IEPs in 9th-12th grades. Therefore, for calculating percentages of drop-outs for youth with IEPs, FSM-HESA utilized the 618 child count data, which accounted for the typical age of enrollment for grades 9th – 12th. As discussed during the November 2005 input session, caution would need to be made when comparing the percentages for youth without IEPs and youth with IEPs because of the enrollment numbers utilized. Also, Chuuk provided only the number of drop-outs for youth with IEPs who were in the 12th grade. However, with stakeholder input, it was agreed that the percentages shown in the Baseline Data section would represent FSM’s baseline for setting targets, with school year 2005-2006 focused on ensuring consistent definitions and accurate accounting for all drop-outs.

As shown in the Tables below, the breakdown of the 2004-2005 LEA reported drop-out data reveals that the percentage of youth with IEPs who dropped out was more than those without IEPs in Kosrae and Yap, as compared to Chuuk and Pohnpei where the percentage of youth with IEPs who dropped out was less than those without IEPs. However, as noted, Chuuk reported only drop-out numbers for seniors with IEPs. For Kosrae, a review of 9th-12th grade records at the school level verified the information for this reporting period. In fact, as a result of this SPP review, the FSM 618 Exit data submitted for 2004-2005 will be corrected to include Kosrae’s updated data for youth with IEPs who dropped out.

CHUUK:

School Year	% Youth with and without IEPs Who Dropped-Out in Chuuk					
	Youth without IEPs			Youth with IEPs		
	#9-12 th graders	#Drop-Outs	%Drop-Outs	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop-Outs	%Drop-Outs
2004-2005	3280	442	13%	435	4*	1%

*Number represents drop-outs from 12th grade only

KOSRAE:

School Year	% Youth with and without IEPs Who Dropped-Out in Kosrae					
	Youth without IEPs			Youth with IEPs		
	#9-12 th graders	#Drop-Outs	%Drop-Outs	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop-Outs	%Drop-Outs
2004-2005	776	26	3%	114	17	15%

POHNPEI:

School Year	% Youth with and without IEPs Who Dropped-Out in Pohnpei					
	Youth without IEPs			Youth with IEPs		
	#9-12 th graders	#Drop-Outs	%Drop-Outs	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop-Outs	%Drop-Outs
2004-2005	2451	101	4%	248	2	1%

YAP:

School Year	% Youth with and without IEPs Who Dropped-Out in Yap					
	Youth without IEPs			Youth with IEPs		
	#9-12 th graders	#Drop-Outs	%Drop-Outs	#9-12 th Graders	#Drop-Outs	%Drop-Outs
2004-2005	791	34	4%	55	5	9%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	3% of youth with IEPs drop-out of high school, which represents working towards improved performance compared to the percent of all youth in FSM dropping out of high school.
2006 (2006-2007)	3% of youth with IEPs drop-out of high school, which represents working towards improved performance compared to the percent of all youth in FSM dropping out of high school.
2007 (2007-2008)	2.5% of youth with IEPs drop-out of high school, which represents working towards improved performance compared to the percent of all youth in FSM dropping out of high school.
2008 (2008-2009)	2% of youth with IEPs drop-out of high school, which represents working towards improved performance compared to the percent of all youth in FSM dropping out of high school.
2009 (2009-2010)	1% of youth with IEPs drop-out of high school, which represents working towards improved performance compared to the percent of all youth in FSM dropping out of high school.
2010 (2010-2011)	0% of youth with IEPs drop-out of high school, which represents working towards improved performance compared to the percent of all youth in FSM dropping out of high school.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

1. During school year 2005-2006, FSM-HESA to ensure consistency in drop-out definition in all four LEAs, including considerations for appropriate grade assignments, to include drop-outs with and without disabilities.
 - 1.1 Timeline: School year 2005-2006.
 - 2.2 Resources: Evaluation Specialist for EMIS.

2. Beginning school year 2005-2006, interface SPP drop-out data requirements with EMIS and the special education Student Information Tracking System (SITS) for reporting accurate and timely data for all levels: School, LEA, and National, to include federal reporting for drop-out data (exit data for special education).
 - 2.1 Timeline: Full implementation in 2005-2006 with annual upgrades and verification of accuracy in data collected through the LEA quarterly reports and annual FSM-HESA monitoring/verification visits.
 - 2.2 Resources: Technical support from appropriate Institution of Higher Education (IHE) or other technical assistance provider for data system upgrades; FSM-HESA Evaluation Specialist for EMIS implementation.

3. Continue monitoring the collection of drop-out comparison data through LEA quarterly reports to FSM-HESA and the FSM-HESA on-site monitoring/verification visits, as scheduled during the school year.
 - 3.1 Timeline: Quarterly for state reports, with targeted follow-up assistance, as needed, to LEAs to ensure the availability of comparison data for reporting, as well as to address programming issues that might have impacted the number of drop-outs for youth with IEPs. Annual monitoring visits to each LEA. Annually for monitoring/verification visits, with report findings disseminated to all LEAs. Analysis of the reports will assist FSM-HESA with prioritizing nation-wide targeted improvement activities for subsequent years.
 - 3.2 Resource: Technical support from appropriate IHE or technical assistance provider for monitoring visits.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to description before Indicator 1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of districts 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 in the State times 100.

B. Participation rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed;
- 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 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 grades assessed;
- b. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed 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 grades assessed 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 grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level standards (percent = d divided by a times 100); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100).

Overall Percent = b + c + d + e divided by a.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

FSM-HESA contracted the University of Guam CEDDERS to provide technical support for the development of a nation-wide accountability system for determining participation and performance of children with disabilities in the National Standardized Test (NST) and/or alternate assessment. The determination for participation in the NST and/or alternate assessment was included in the revisions to the Special Education Procedural Manual reviewed during the on-site Local Education Agency (LEA) training held in Chuuk, Pohnpei, and Kosrae between January – May 2004. Special Education personnel from the Yap LEA participated in the Kosrae training due to the devastation experienced by Yap from Typhoon Sudal in April 2004. Updates to the manual based on IDEA 2004 were completed in June 2005 with full implementation of all procedures, including participation determination, during school year 2005-2006.

In March 2004, University of Guam CEDDERS conducted a technical assistance visit to Pohnpei to work with the FSM-HESA Assessment Specialist responsible for facilitating the administration of the NST in each LEA. An Assessment Orientation Summit, held in December 2004, was designed for state representatives to review the specific procedures for administering the NST, to include providing appropriate accommodations as required by the IEP, and the implementation of an alternate assessment. The Summit resulted in the development of written assessment guidelines. The guidelines supported the IEP determination process, including procedures for identifying appropriate accommodations or modifications, and participation in an alternate assessment through the development of student portfolios.

The written assessment guidelines provide for the steps to ensure that students with disabilities participate in FSM's student accountability system, to include, as appropriate, participation in a portfolio-designed alternate assessment. With the guidelines completed in December 2004, it is anticipated that baseline participation data would be collected and compiled during the April/May 2005 NST week for all four LEAs. The analysis of performance of students with disabilities in the NST and/or alternate assessment will not be fully implemented until school year 2005-2006 for baseline data on performance.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Measurement A: AYP requirement under NCLB does not apply to FSM.

Measurement B: Participation Rate

The Table below shows the participation rate of students with disabilities for the two NST assessment areas of Language Arts and Math for 6th, 8th, and 10th grades. The total participation rate of 43% represents students with disabilities in the grades assessed that had taken one or both of the assessment areas. As indicated in the breakdown by grades and assessment areas, some students with IEPs had taken one area, such as the math assessment and not the other area, the language arts assessment. Further, as noted, the Chuuk data represents the NST sampling process implemented based on the NST administration guidelines. Unlike the other FSM states that administered the test to the assigned grades in all schools, given Chuuk's geographic challenges, FSM-HESA developed a sampling system for administering the NST for that LEA. The sampling process takes into consideration the reliability and validity of the test results for reporting.

NST Lang. Art	FSM TOTAL # & %: 2004-2005 National Standardized Test (NST) Results for Participation					
	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
Grade 6	83	47	2	0	0	59% (49/83)
Grade 8	93	32	0	0	0	34% (32/93)
Grade 10*	84	17	0	0	0	20% (17/84)
NST Math						
Grade 6	83	50	2	0	0	63% (52/83)
Grade 8	93	39	0	0	0	42% (39/93)
Grade 10*	84	21	0	0	0	25% (21/84)
TOTAL #	260	110 (one or both)	2 (both)	0	0	
%		42%	1%	0%	0%	43% (112/260)

*Data does not include 10th grade enrollment number of students with disabilities from Chuuk's sampled schools. Chuuk did not report 10th graders with IEPs in the selected secondary schools.

Measurement C: Proficiency Rate – Not Available for 2004-2005

Discussion of Baseline Data:

School year 2004-2005 represents the first year FSM-HESA has been able to report participation data for students with disabilities. Previously, FSM's assessment system was not set up to account for students with disabilities taking the nation-wide assessment. Although the participation rate of 43% for FSM overall appears to be a low participation percentage, the procedural changes in the administration of the NST and the tracking of students with disabilities participating in the nation-wide assessment have improved demonstrating FSM-HESA's ability to account for all students in the National Standardized Test (NST) for grades 6th, 8th, and 10th. It is anticipated that for school year 2005-2006, the administration of the NST and alternate assessment will increase the participation rate of students with disabilities in the tested grades. With stakeholder input, it was agreed that the 60% projected target for participation in school year 2005-2006 represents a significant increase that would allow for an analysis of student performance.

The Tables below show the participation breakdown by LEAs. As noted, given Chuuk's geographic challenges, FSM-HESA administers the NST in Chuuk using a sampling process, which accounts for appropriate representation of school size and performance for selected schools within and outside the lagoon area. For school year 2004-2005, of the 79 public elementary and secondary schools in Chuuk, 11 elementary schools, 3 junior high schools, and 1 high school were selected to participate in the NST. Of the selected elementary schools, 7 of the 11 elementary schools served students with IEPs; of which, 5 of the 7 elementary schools served students with IEPs in the tested grades. The other 2 elementary schools did not have students with IEPs in the tested grades, but reported serving students with IEPs in the lower grades. The selected secondary schools did not report students with IEPs in the 10th grade.

For Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap, the NST was administered in all schools for the tested grades, which included students with IEPs. The participation rate for school year 2004-2005 by LEAs ranged from 14% in Pohnpei to 100% in Chuuk.

CHUUK: NOTE: Results based on approved FSM-HESA NST sampling process.

NST Lang. Art	CHUUK TOTAL # & %: 2004-2005 National Standardized Test (NST) Results for Participation					
	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
Grade 6	29	29	0	0	0	100%
Grade 8	20	20	0	0	0	100%
Grade 10*	0	0	0	0	0	0
NST Math						
Grade 6	29	29	0	0	0	100%
Grade 8	20	20	0	0	0	100%
Grade 10*	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL #	49	49	0	0	0	
%		100%	0%	0%	0%	100% (49/49)

*Data does not include 10th grade enrollment number of students with disabilities from Chuuk's sampled schools. Chuuk did not report 10th graders with IEPs in the selected secondary schools.

KOSRAE:

NST Lang. Art	KOSRAE TOTAL # & %: 2004-2005 National Standardized Test (NST) Results for Participation					
	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
Grade 6	17	12	0	0	0	71% (12/17)
Grade 8	7	4	0	0	0	57% (4/7)
Grade 10	47	7	0	0	0	15% (7/47)
NST Math						
Grade 6	17	12	0	0	0	71% (12/17)
Grade 8	7	5	0	0	0	71% (5/7)
Grade 10	47	7	0	0	0	15% (7/47)
TOTAL #	71	24 (one or both)	0	0	0	
%		34%	0%	0%	0%	34% (24/71)

POHNPEI:

NST Lang. Art	POHNPEI TOTAL # & %: 2004-2005 National Standardized Test (NST) Results for Participation					
	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
Grade 6	26	0	0	0	0	0%
Grade 8	55	0	0	0	0	0%
Grade 10	27	2	0	0	0	7% (2/27)
NST Math						
Grade 6	26	3	0	0	0	12%(3/26)
Grade 8	55	6	0	0	0	11% (6/55)
Grade 10	27	6	0	0	0	22% (6/27)
TOTAL #	108	15 (one or both)	0	0	0	
%		14%	0%	0%	0%	14% (15/108)

YAP:

NST Lang. Art	YAP TOTAL # & %: 2004-2005 National Standardized Test (NST) Results for Participation					
	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
Grade 6	11	6	2	0	0	73% (8/11)
Grade 8	11	8	0	0	0	73% (8/11)
Grade 10	10	8	0	0	0	80% (8/10)
NST Math						
Grade 6	11	6	2	0	0	73% (8/11)
Grade 8	11	8	0	0	0	73% (8/11)
Grade 10	10	8	0	0	0	80% (8/10)
TOTAL #	32	22	2	0	0	
%		69%	6%	0%	0%	75% (24/32)

FAPE in the LRE: Statewide and Districtwide Assessment, OSEP Response Letter, September 22, 2005

The OSEP letter, dated September 22, 2005, responded to the FFY 2003 Part B Annual Performance Report (APR), which included improvement strategies for addressing the participation and performance of children with disabilities in the FSM state-wide assessment, the National Standardized Test (NST) administered to 6th, 8th, and 10th graders. OSEP indicated acceptance of the strategies and required FSM-HESA to include data and analysis documenting progress toward compliance in the SPP, with a final report to OSEP, including data and analysis demonstrating compliance, no later than May 31, 2006.

The baseline data and discussion of baseline provided for Indicator 3 demonstrate FSM-HESA's efforts to meet the requirements for ensuring children with disabilities are included in the FSM National assessment system. As noted in the overview, the procedures for determining participation and implementing an alternate assessment have been completed with full implementation in school year 2005-2006. With stakeholder input, it was agreed that the 2005-2006 analysis of performance data for participating students with disabilities in tested grades would serve as baseline data for determining proficiency targets for subsequent years. However, to address the statutory requirements to include SPP targets for each Indicator subcomponent, FSM-HESA determined that it would be reasonable to project percentage of increases each year as the projected targets that align with the performance goals for all students in the tested grades. FSM-HESA has set an improvement goal for all students in the tested grades of at least a 1% increase each year in performance at the proficient or above level. It is understood that adjustments to the projected targets may be made as a result of compiling and analyzing actual performance data for students with disabilities in the tested grades for the April/May 2005 and April/May 2006 assessment periods, as well as changes to FSM-HESA's improvement goals for all students in the tested grades.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Not Applicable to FSM.

	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p align="center">2006 (2006-2007)</p>	<p>Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Not Applicable to FSM.</p> <p>B. 65% 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.</p> <p>C. At least 1% increase in proficiency rate from the 2005-2006 performance percentage for children with IEPs who performed at the proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations, regular assessment with accommodations, alternate assessment against grade level standards, and against alternate achievement standards.</p>
<p align="center">2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Not Applicable to FSM.</p> <p>B. 70% participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>C. At least 2% increase in proficiency rate from the 2005-2006 performance percentage for children with IEPs who performed at the proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations, regular assessment with accommodations, alternate assessment against grade level standards, and against alternate achievement standards.</p>
<p align="center">2008 (2008-2009)</p>	<p>Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Not Applicable to FSM.</p> <p>B. 80% 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.</p> <p>C. At least 3% increase in proficiency rate from the 2005-2006 performance percentage for children with IEPs who performed at the proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations, regular assessment with accommodations, alternate assessment against grade level standards, and against alternate achievement standards.</p>
<p align="center">2009 (2009-2010)</p>	<p>Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Not Applicable to FSM.</p> <p>B. 90% 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.</p> <p>C. At least 4% increase in proficiency rate from the 2005-2006 performance percentage for children with IEPs who performed at the proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations, regular assessment with accommodations, alternate assessment against grade level standards, and against alternate achievement standards.</p>
<p align="center">2010 (2010-2011)</p>	<p>Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Not Applicable to FSM.</p> <p>B. 100% 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.</p> <p>C. At least 5% increase in proficiency rate from the 2005-2006 performance percentage for children with IEPs who performed at the proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations, regular assessment with accommodations, alternate assessment against grade level standards, and against alternate achievement standards.</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

1. Beginning school year 2005-2006, FSM-HESA to ensure full implementation of the special education procedures for determining participation in the nation-wide assessment system, as well as the alternate assessment for those students with disabilities who are not able to participate in the NST, to include follow-up training for special education and assessment personnel in each LEA.
 - 1.1 Timeline: Beginning school year 2005-2006.
 - 2.2 Resources: FSM-HESA Assessment Specialist for NST.
2. Beginning school year 2005-2006, 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.
 - 2.1 Timeline: Full implementation in 2005-2006 with annual upgrades and verification of accuracy in data collected through the LEA quarterly reports and annual FSM-HESA monitoring/verification visits.
 - 2.2 Resources: 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.
3. Continue monitoring the implementation of the special education procedures for participation rate, as well as proficiency rates, in the nation-wide assessment system 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.
 - 3.1 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.
 - 3.2 Resource: Technical support from appropriate IHE or technical assistance provider for monitoring visits.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to description before Indicator 1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

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)(2))

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 # 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 # of districts in the State times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

FSM-HESA has determined that the comparison requirement for suspension/expulsion will be to compare rates amongst the four FSM Local Education Agencies (LEAs): Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap. However, as the FSM-HESA Education Management Information System (EMIS) interface with the special education Student Information Tracking System (SITS) is fully implemented, attempts to gather similar data for students without disabilities will be done to assess long-term implications for the overall education system.

As required, the determination of "significant discrepancy" must be defined by the state/entity. As per OSEP's instructions, "discrepancy can be computed by either comparing rates for children with disabilities to rates for nondisabled within a district OR by comparing among LEAs for children with disabilities in the state." Since FSM-HESA has determined that comparison data will be amongst the four FSM Local Education Agencies (LEAs), the comparison among LEAs would be the method for determining "significant discrepancy" of suspension and expulsion rates.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

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

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, 2002	1053	3	.3%	15	1.4%	18	1.7%
December 1, 2003	1035	0	0	0	0	0	0
December 1, 2004	1179	0	0	0	0	0	0

*Child Count Total for Ages 3-21

KOSRAE:

Child Count Reporting Period	Total # with IEPs*	Kosrae Reported 618 Suspension Data for the School Year					
		Single Suspensions > than 10 Days		Multiple Suspensions > than 10 Days		TOTAL # & %	
		#	% of Total	#	% of Total	#	% of Total
December 1, 2002	391	6	1.5%	8	2%	14	3.5%
December 1, 2003	354	0	0	4	1.1%	4	1.1%
December 1, 2004	249	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, 2002	854	3	.4%	6	.7%	9	1.1%
December 1, 2003	906	0	0	0	0	0	0
December 1, 2004	843	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, 2002	284	0	0	4	1.4%	4	1.4%
December 1, 2003	286	0	0	4	1.4%	4	1.4%
December 1, 2004	169	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 Baseline Data:

At this time, with the baseline data for 2004-2005 for all four LEAs showing that NO children with IEPs were suspended for greater than 10 days for a single incident or multiple incidents, there wasn't a discrepancy between LEAs for special education. In fact, the FSM SPP review resulted in a correction to the 618 Discipline and Exit data for 2004-2005. Kosrae reported discipline data that was accounted for under “drop-outs.” It was therefore verified that Kosrae didn't have any suspensions greater than 10 days.

Given the 2004-2005 suspension/expulsion data, FSM-HESA determined that it would be reasonable to expect no significant discrepancy in rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year between the LEAs.

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.
2006 (2006-2007)	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.
2007 (2007-2008)	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.
2008 (2008-2009)	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.
2009 (2009-2010)	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.
2010 (2010-2011)	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.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

1. During school year 2005-2006, FSM-HESA to ensure consistency in “suspension/expulsion” definition in all four LEAs.
 - 1.1 Timeline: School year 2005-2006.
 - 2.2 Resources: FSM-HESA Evaluation Specialist for EMIS.

2. Beginning school year 2005-2006, interface SPP suspension/expulsion data requirements with EMIS and the special education Student Information Tracking System (SITS) for reporting accurate and timely data for all levels: School, LEA, and National, to include federal reporting for discipline data.
 - 1.1 Timeline: Full implementation in 2005-2006 with annual upgrades and verification of accuracy in data collected through the quarterly LEA reports and annual FSM-HESA monitoring/verification visits.
 - 2.2 Resources: Technical support from appropriate Institution of Higher Education (IHE) or other technical assistance provider for data system upgrades; FSM-HESA Evaluation Specialist for EMIS implementation.

3. Continue monitoring the implementation of the special education procedures for accounting for suspension/expulsion data through FSM LEA quarterly reports to FSM-HESA and the FSM-HESA on-site monitoring/verification visits, as scheduled during the school year.
 - 3.1 Timeline: Quarterly for LEA reports. Annual monitoring visits to each LEA. Analysis of the reports will assist FSM-HESA with prioritizing nation-wide targeted improvement activities for subsequent years.
 - 3.2 Resource: Technical support from appropriate IHE or technical assistance provider for monitoring visits.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to description before Indicator 1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

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;
- 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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) determination in the special education process has always been in the Special Education Procedural Manual developed and revised over the years. In June 2005, the manual was updated to include, as appropriate, changes to the procedural requirements based on IDEA 2004 and the proposed regulations, as well as the FSM Public Law 14-08, which reinforces the LRE provisions of IDEA. The FSM P.L. 14-08 was enacted in June 2005. The update provided another opportunity to conduct specific training on the procedures for each Local Education Agency (LEA) in Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap scheduled for the beginning of school year 2005-2006. Accordingly, the revisions to the manual will be finalized upon final approval of the IDEA regulations.

The FSM-HESA monitoring system is designed to identify non-compliance in the area of ensuring the implementation of the LRE provisions of IDEA Part B requirements. The Child Record Review and Interviews conducted during the monitoring/verification visits provide for the specific review of documentation and understanding of procedures.

As noted in the FSM-HESA monitoring report for the December 2004 monitoring/verification visit conducted for Pohnpei, one of the monitoring findings was related to Pohnpei ensuring that services provided are based on the needs of the child with a disability and not availability of services. As a result, the revisions to the special education procedural manual in June 2005 provided another opportunity for training staff on the determination of appropriate services and the delivery of those individualized special education and related services in the least restrictive environment. A final report from Pohnpei describing actions taken to ensure appropriate delivery of services will be submitted to FSM-HESA as part of the Pohnpei's LEA quarterly report due by December 2005, which represents the one-year timeframe for correcting the identified non-compliance areas based on the one-site visit conducted in December 2004.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The following Table displays the FSM 618 reported data for placement taken on December 1, 2004. As shown, the majority of FSM's school-age students with IEPs, representing 97% of the total served, was removed from the general education program for less than 21% of the day.

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%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Using the 618 reported LRE trend data, over the years, the majority of students with IEPs in the FSM has been included in general education programs for most of the day. As shown in the OSEP 618 LRE Placement Data Table below, overall, on December 1, 2002, 90% of the 6-21 age group participated in the general education program for most of the day, 96% in 2003, and 97% in 2004.

FSM-HESA ensures that special education and related services are provided in the least restrictive environment based on the individual needs of the child with a disability. The FSM Special Education Procedural Manual provides guidance to each state for identifying, referring, evaluating, determining eligibility, developing an IEP, determining placement, and documenting exiting procedures for each child with a disability. The FSM-HESA monitoring system is designed to identify non-compliance to include ensuring that each LEA follows the LRE provisions of the IDEA Part B requirements.

OSEP 618 LRE Placement Data for FSM TOTAL

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, 2002	2040	1842	90%	65	3%	133	7%
December 1, 2003	2202	2121	96%	23	1%	58	3%
December 1, 2004	2163	2099	97%	0	0	64	3%

As mentioned in the 2003 Self-Assessment Report and Annual Performance Reports, FSM-HESA was "reinstated" to submit 618 data reports in 2002 through the IDEA Special Education Program for Pacific Island Entities (SEPIIE) funding provisions. At that time, each LEA had to restore the 618 definitions into the data system for collecting, compiling, and reporting accurate data. For the LRE Placement data by LEA, each LEA needed to review definitions for each placement based on the OSEP definitions. The following Tables show each LEA's 618 reported data for LRE Placement for school-age children with disabilities:

OSEP 618 LRE Placement Data by FSM Local Education Agencies (LEAs):

CHUUK: 2002-2004: 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

KOSRAE: 2002-2004: 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%

POHNPEI: 2002-2004: 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%

YAP: 2002-2004: 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%

With input from stakeholders during the November 2005 input sessions, it was agreed that although FSM's educational environment data is above the U.S. national average, FSM would improve special education and related services provided for children with IEPs served primarily in separate schools or at home (Measurement C of this indicator). With discussion regarding how much improvement, the Measurable and Rigorous Targets for this 6-year SPP show an overall movement for children with IEPs served under the environments listed in Measurement C to other educational environments, to include the 21%-60% educational environment not reported as a measurement requirement for this indicator.

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: 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.
2006 (2006-2007)	Based on the unique needs of each child with a disability, on December 1, 2006, the percent of children with IEPs ages 6 through 21 served to include: A. 97% Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day; B. .25% Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; and C. 2.5% Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or

	homebound or hospital placements.
2007 (2007-2008)	Based on the unique needs of each child with a disability, on December 1, 2007, the percent of children with IEPs ages 6 through 21 served to include: A. 97.25% Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day; B. .25% Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; and C. 2.25% Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.
2008 (2008-2009)	Based on the unique needs of each child with a disability, on December 1, 2008, the percent of children with IEPs ages 6 through 21 served to include: A. 97.50% Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day; B. .25% Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; and C. 2% Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.
2009 (2009-2010)	Based on the unique needs of each child with a disability, on December 1, 2009, the percent of children with IEPs ages 6 through 21 served to include: A. 97.75% Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day; B. .25% Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; and C. 1.75% Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.
2010 (2010-2011)	Based on the unique needs of each child with a disability, on December 1, 2010, the percent of children with IEPs ages 6 through 21 served to include: A. 98% Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day; B. .25% Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; and C. 1.5% Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

1. During school year 2005-2006, full implementation of the special education Student Information Tracking System (SITS) will provide for the collection and reporting of accurate and timely data for all levels: School, LEA, and National, to include federal reporting for School-Age LRE – Educational Environments
 - 1.1 Timeline: Full implementation in 2005-2006 with annual upgrades and verification of accuracy in data collected through the annual FSM-HESA monitoring/verification visits.
 - 1.2 Resources: Technical support from appropriate Institution of Higher Education (IHE) or other technical assistance provider for data system upgrades.

2. Parent and staff training implemented for each LEA to ensure understanding of the June 2005 revisions to the Special Education Procedural Manual, to include a review of the LRE provisions, based on the IDEA 2004 and proposed regulations, as well as effective strategies for providing special education and related services in general education program environments.
 - 2.1 Timeline: At least annually through the summer parent conference and beginning of the year staff training.
 - 2.2 Resources: Each LEA special education program and parent organization.

3. Continue monitoring the provisions of LRE through the LEA quarterly reports and FSM-HESA on-site monitoring/verification visits, as scheduled during the school year.
 - 3.1 Timeline: Quarterly for LEA reports. Annual monitoring visits to each LEA. Analysis of reports to assist FSM-HESA with prioritizing targeted improvement activities for subsequent years.
 - 3.2 Resource: Technical support from appropriate IHE or technical assistance provider for monitoring visits.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to description before Indicator 1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

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 (e.g., 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 all special education services in settings with typically developing peers divided by the total # of preschool children with IEPs times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) determination in the special education process has always been in the Special Education Procedural Manual developed and revised over the years. In June 2005, the manual was updated to include, as appropriate, changes to the procedural requirements based on IDEA 2004 and the proposed regulations, as well as the FSM Public Law 14-08, which reinforces the LRE provisions of IDEA. The FSM P.L. 14-08 was enacted in June 2005. The update provided another opportunity to conduct specific training on the procedures for each Local Education Agency (LEA) in Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap scheduled for the beginning of school year 2005-2006. Accordingly, the revisions to the manual will be finalized upon final approval of the IDEA regulations.

During school year 2004-2005, written guidelines for the FSM National Early Care and Education for Young Children with Special Needs and their Families were developed by FSM-HESA and early childhood representatives from the four FSM island state organizations and agencies that work with young children, to include the Local Education Agency (LEA) and Health Services. The purpose for the guidelines was to describe the specific steps of the special education process in relation to the collaborative relationship between Education and Health Services for young children with special needs. In the FSM, compulsory education begins at six years of age or first grade. Preschool services for young children with and without disabilities have been provided through the joint efforts of Head Start (now known as the Early Childhood Program under Education), the Education Preschool Initiative, and Health Services.

The FSM-HESA monitoring system is designed to identify non-compliance in the area of ensuring the implementation of the LRE provisions of IDEA Part B requirements. The Child Record Review and Interviews conducted during the monitoring/verification visits provide for the specific review of documentation and understanding of procedures. The monitoring review will consider the supports and services for preschoolers with special needs provided through the collaborative relationship between Education and Health Services.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The following Table displays the FSM 618 reported data for preschool settings taken on December 1, 2004. As shown, the majority of FSM's preschoolers with IEPs, representing 30% of the total served, was served in settings with typically developing peers.

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%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Using the 618 reported LRE trend data, over the years, there has been a decrease in percentage of preschoolers with IEPs included in early childhood programs for typically developing peers or receiving services in the home. As shown in the OSEP 618 LRE Settings Data for Ages 3-5 Table below, overall, on December 1, 2002, 52% of the 3-5 age group received services in an early childhood program or at home, 56% in 2003, and 30% in 2004.

FSM-HESA ensures that special education and related services are provided in the least restrictive environment based on the individual needs of the child with a disability. The FSM Special Education Procedural Manual and the FSM Early Care and Education for Young Children with Special Needs and their Families provide guidance to each LEA for identifying, referring, evaluating, determining eligibility, developing an IEP, determining placement, and documenting exiting procedures. The FSM-HESA monitoring system is designed to identify non-compliance to include ensuring that each state follows the LRE provisions of the IDEA Part B requirements.

OSEP 618 LRE Setting 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, 2002	442	136	31%	93	21%	0	0	229	52%
December 1, 2003	379	105	28%	105	28%	0	0	210	56%
December 1, 2004	277	57	21%	26	9%	0	0	83	30%

As mentioned in the 2003 Self-Assessment Report and Annual Performance Reports, FSM-HESA was "reinstated" to submit 618 data reports in 2002 through the IDEA Special Education Program for Pacific Island Entities (SEPPIE) funding provisions. At that time, each LEA had to restore the 618 definitions into the data system for collecting, compiling, and reporting accurate data. For the LRE Setting data by LEA, each LEA needed to review definitions for each setting based on the OSEP definitions. The following Tables show each LEA's 618 reported data for LRE Settings for preschoolers with IEPs:

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

CHUUK: 2002-2004: 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

KOSRAE: 2002-2004: 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%

POHNPEI: 2002-2004: 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%

YAP: 2002-2004: 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%

Given the decrease in percentage of preschoolers with IEPs served in settings with typically developing peers or at home, with stakeholder input during the November 2005 input sessions, it was agreed that, overall, FSM's Measurable and Rigorous Targets for the SPP should work towards meeting the U.S. National Average. It was further discussed that specific technical support needs to be targeted for Chuuk's LEA to increase services and supports in settings with typically developing peers. As shown in the 618 LRE Settings Data for each LEA, Chuuk is the only LEA that did not include preschoolers with IEPs in settings with typically developing peers. Chuuk's LEA provided special education and related services in special education preschool settings. However, given that the Head Start Program is now under Education, Chuuk has an opportunity to provide appropriate special education services in the LEA's Early Childhood Program.

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).
2006 (2006-2007)	Based on the unique needs of each preschooler with a disability, on December 1, 2006, 35% 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).
2007 (2007-2008)	Based on the unique needs of each preschooler with a disability, on December 1, 2007, 40% 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).
2008 (2008-2009)	Based on the unique needs of each preschooler with a disability, on December 1, 2008, 45% 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).
2009 (2009-2010)	Based on the unique needs of each preschooler with a disability, on December 1, 2009, 50% 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).
2010 (2010-2011)	Based on the unique needs of each preschooler with a disability, on December 1, 2010, 55% 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).

childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).
--

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

1. During school year 2005-2006, full implementation of the special education Student Information Tracking System (SITS) will provide for the collection and reporting of accurate and timely data for all levels: School, LEA, and National, to include federal reporting for Preschool LRE.
 - 1.1 Timeline: Full implementation in 2005-2006 with annual upgrades and verification of accuracy in data collected through the annual FSM-HESA monitoring/verification visits.
 - 1.2 Resources: Technical support from appropriate Institution of Higher Education (IHE) or other technical assistance provider for data system upgrades.

2. Parent and Staff training implemented for each LEA to ensure understanding of the June 2005 revisions to the Special Education Procedural Manual, to include a review of the LRE provisions, based on the IDEA 2004 and proposed regulations.
 - 2.1 Timeline: At least annually through the summer parent conference and beginning of the year staff training.
 - 2.2 Resources: Each LEA special education program and parent organization.

3. Targeted technical support for Chuuk LEA to address the LRE provisions, including training for parents and staff in Chuuk regarding effective inclusive strategies for preschoolers with IEPs.
 - 3.1 Timeline: School year 2005-2006.
 - 3.2 Resources: Chuuk LEA special education program and parent organization.

4. Continue monitoring the provisions of LRE in each state through the LEA quarterly reports and FSM-HESA on-site monitoring/verification visits, as scheduled during the school year.
 - 4.1 Timeline: Quarterly for LEA reports. Annual monitoring visits to each LEA. Analysis of reports to assist FSM-HESA with prioritizing targeted improvement activities for subsequent years.
 - 4.2 Resource: Technical support from appropriate IHE or technical assistance provider for monitoring visits.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to description before Indicator 1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

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 reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improve functioning = # of preschool children who improved functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = # of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.

If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c 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 reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning = # of preschool children who improved functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = # of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.

If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- a. Percent of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.

- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning = # of preschool children who improved functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = # of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.

If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

NEW INDICATOR. The following design for gathering baseline data for this new indicator was taken from the guidance provided by the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center:

1. The FSM Early Childhood (EC) Leadership Team, comprised of the FSM-HESA Early Childhood Special Education Coordinator and representatives from the four Local Education Agencies (LEAs) of Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap, including the LEA Early Childhood Coordinators/Supervisors, Special Education Coordinators, Data Specialists, Parents, and the Maternal and Child Health & Children with Special Needs Coordinators, to develop the outcome measurement system for FSM, to include:
 - Policies and procedures to guide outcome assessment and measurement practices.
 - Provision of training and technical assistance supports to administrators and service providers in outcome data collection, reporting, and use of quality assurance and monitoring procedures to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the outcome data.
 - Data system elements for outcome data input and maintenance, and outcome data analysis functions.
2. In October 2005, the FSM EC Leadership Team met to review the “Early Childhood Outcomes Framework” and to gather input on a process for developing measurement strategies as part of the overall outcome measurement system to be implemented in each LEA, as follows:
 - Who will be included in the measurement, i.e. what population of children?
 - All preschoolers with IEPs who will be receiving special education services for at least 6 months.
 - What assessment/measurement tool(s) will be used?
 - In August 2005, FSM-HESA requested technical assistance from the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC) to review the *Micronesian Inventory of Development* (MID) and to provide an analysis of whether the MID will answer the preschool outcomes identified in SPP Indicator 7. The MID has been used as a developmental screener and to monitor progress of preschoolers in the Head Start Program throughout the Pacific Basin jurisdictions, to include FSM, which the Head Start Program now is known as the Early Childhood Program under the FSM LEAs. In response to this request, NECTAC facilitated a conference call in October 2005 with the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center consultants who conducted the MID review and representatives from the Pacific Island entities, to include the FSM. Based on the “crosswalk” analysis, the MID will be able to answer preschool outcome measures “B” and “C” of this indicator.
 - By December 2005, the FSM EC Leadership Team members from each LEA will review the preschool outcome measures required of this indicator and will gather input regarding the cultural relevancy of the preschool outcome measures and to translate the outcome measures into their primary language.
 - In January 2006, the FSM EC Leadership will convene to review the results of the MID Crosswalk conducted by the ECO consultants and to reach an agreement as to what assessment/measurement tool(s) will be used. Items for consideration would be to expand the MID to respond to all 3 preschool outcome measures or to identify another assessment/measurement tool(s).
 - Who will conduct the assessments?
 - In January 2006, the FSM EC Leadership Team will develop procedures for conducting the assessments.
 - When will measurement occur?
 - By January 2006, the FSM EC Leadership Team will develop procedures outlining specific steps of when preschoolers with IEPs will be assessed at “entry” and “exit” points while in the program.
 - By May 2006, all preschoolers with IEPs who will be receiving at least 6 months of special education services will be assessed for “entry” data.
 - Who will report data to whom, in conducted what form, and how often?

- o By January 2006, the FSM EC Leadership Team will outline specific timelines and guidance for how the outcomes data will be gathered and reported at the LEA level and retrieved by the FSM special education Student Information Tracking System (SITS).
 - o The LEA Special Education Data Clerk will input the data results for Child Outcomes 1, 2 and 3 into the FSM special Education Student Information Tracking System (SITS). FSM-HESA will collect, compile, analyze, and report findings as a system with information provided on a quarterly basis by the LEA, with aggregated data reviewed on an annual basis by June of each year for national analysis and reporting.
 - How will data be analyzed?
 - o By January 2006, the FSM EC Leadership Team will define how the results of the preschool outcome measures will be analyzed and reported at the LEA and FSM-HESA National levels to include the following:
 - a. Percentage of children who reach or maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.
 - b. Percentage of children who improve functioning (not included in a).
 - c. Percentage of children who did not improve functioning.
3. The FSM EC Leadership Team to facilitate the implementation of the outcome measurement system in each LEA, to include:
- By March 2006, the FSM EC Early Childhood Outcome Measurement System requirements will be approved by the FSM-HESA Secretary and disseminated to the Directors of the LEAs.
 - By April 2006, FSM-HESA to facilitate training for LEAs on the FSM Early Childhood Outcomes Measurement System, which will include the procedures, timelines, and data collection process.
 - By April 2006, FSM-HESA to facilitate training for LEAs on the FSM Early Childhood Outcome Assessment tool.
 - By May 2006, all preschoolers with IEPs who will be receiving at least 6 months of special education services will be assessed using the FSM Early Childhood Outcome Assessment Tool.
 - By June 2006, LEA EC outcomes data will be inputted into the FSM special education Student Information Tracking System (SITS) by the LEA special education data clerk.
 - By June 2007, FSM-HESA will collect, compile, and report progress data on “entry” and “exit” outcomes data for improving services by specific LEA as well as for national analysis and reporting.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Report on status of “entry” data to be included in 2005-2006 APR due February 2007.

Progress data to be summarized and reported in 2006-2007 APR due February 2008.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	No Target expected – New Indicator.
2006 (2006-2007)	No Target expected – New Indicator.
2007 (2007-2008)	Target to be established in 2006-2007.
2008 (2008-2009)	Target to be established in 2006-2007.
2009 (2009-2010)	Target to be established in 2006-2007.
2010 (2010-2011)	Target to be established in 2006-2007.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities to be described in 2006-2007 as a result of setting annual targets.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to description before Indicator 1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

NEW INDICATOR. Following the general guidelines for designing a mechanism for gathering baseline data, FSM-HESA provides the following outline for addressing Indicator 8:

1. FSM-HESA to develop and implement a parent focus group process to develop FSM's parent involvement feedback system for addressing Indicator 8, to include:
 - Policies and procedures to guide system-wide survey process.
 - Provision of training and technical assistance supports to administrators and service providers in data collection, reporting, and use of quality assurance and monitoring procedures to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the parent involvement feedback data.
 - Data system elements for parent involvement feedback data input and maintenance, and data analysis functions.
2. With stakeholder input during the input session held in November 2005, the FSM parent focus group membership shall be comprised of, at least, the current Chairpersons of the Local Education Agency (LEA) Steering Committees, who represent parents of children with disabilities, and FSM-HESA representatives.
3. The FSM parent focus group will develop measurement strategies as part of the overall parent involvement feedback system to be implemented in each LEA, as follows:
 - Who will be included in the measurement?
 - All parents of children with IEPs.
 - What assessment/measurement tool(s) will be used?
 - The FSM parent focus group will review FSM LEA developed parent surveys, as well as available sample surveys, such as the NCSEAM Parent Survey and the ECO Part B/619 Family Outcomes Survey to determine an appropriate survey to be used for assessing parent involvement. Development and/or selection of the FSM survey will address, at least, the following general areas:
 - Families reporting that the schools facilitated their knowledge and understanding of their rights and how to advocate effectively for their children.
 - Families reporting that the schools facilitated their capacity for understanding their children's strengths and ways for improving their children's abilities.
 - Families reporting that the schools facilitated their ability to communicate effectively with the special education program as partners in their children's education.
 - The LEA special education coordinators will facilitate the written translation of the survey in their primary language(s).
 - Who will conduct the parent involvement feedback process?

- The FSM-HESA Parent Focus group will develop a survey process based on review of appropriate methods for each LEA that would be culturally relevant and would ensure a non-bias process.
 - For example, interviews and the written survey may need to be done in the family’s primary language, with consistency in administering the process to ensure reliability and validity in the feedback.
- When will the parent involvement feedback process occur?
 - By December 2005, FSM-HESA will disseminate to the LEA Special Education Coordinators the LEA developed parent surveys and sample surveys for review.
 - By January 2006, FSM-HESA will convene the “Parent Focus Group” to identify the survey to be used and to develop procedures for implementation.
 - By February 2006, the LEA Special Education Coordinators will translate the selected survey and administration process to ensure consistency in the implementation of the parent involvement feedback process.
 - By March 2006, LEAs will implement the procedures and conduct the survey.
 - By May 2006, LEAs will forward survey results to FSM-HESA.
 - By May 2006, FSM-HESA to compile and analyze results and report findings to the LEAs.
- How will data be analyzed and reported?
 - Compilation of parent involvement feedback summaries by LEAs to be aggregated by FSM-HESA for national reporting and prioritizing national improvement activities.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

To be included in 2005-2006 APR due in February 2007.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	No Target expected – New Indicator.
2006 (2006-2007)	Target to be established in 2005-2006.
2007 (2007-2008)	Target to be established in 2005-2006.
2008 (2008-2009)	Target to be established in 2005-2006.
2009 (2009-2010)	Target to be established in 2005-2006.
2010 (2010-2011)	Target to be established in 2005-2006.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities to be described in 2005--2006 as a result of setting annual targets.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to description before Indicator 1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

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 # 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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

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

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to description before Indicator 1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

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 # 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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

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

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

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

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to description before Indicator 1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined 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 and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).
- c. # determined eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations 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 eligibility was determined and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = b + c divided by a times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

NEW INDICATOR. The following design outlines general areas or tasks to be completed for gathering baseline data for this compliance requirement:

1. FSM-HESA to develop the measurement system for addressing the 60-day timeline requirement for Indicator 11, to include:
 - Revisions to the data collection procedures that take into account the “date of receipt” of parental consent, as that starts the 60-day timeline.
 - Provision of training and technical assistance supports to the LEA Special Education Coordinators and Data Clerks in data collection, reporting, and use of quality assurance and monitoring procedures to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the data.
 - Upgrade data elements in the FSM special education Student Information Tracking System (SITS) for input and maintenance, and data analysis functions.
2. FSM-HESA to develop the measurement system for addressing the 60-day timeline requirement to be implemented in each LEA, to include:
 - Beginning July 2005, FSM-HESA to facilitate training with LEA Data Clerks on the data collection procedures and updated elements in the FSM special education SITS.
 - Beginning July 2005, FSM-HESA to facilitate the ability of the FSM special education SITS to track the date of “receipt” of parental consent, evaluation, and eligibility determination of all initial IEPs.
 - Through the LEA quarterly reports, each LEA Special Education Coordinator to review and analyze the 60-day timeline data and provide justification for any non-compliance with corrective action measures for meeting the requirement. The LEA quarterly reports will be submitted and reviewed by FSM-HESA for determining needed enforcement actions pursuant to the *Continuous Improvement* Monitoring System. (refer to description of System provided in Indicator 15)

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

To be included in 2005-2006 APR due in February 2007.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator. Baseline data to be collected for review.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of children with parental consent to evaluate are evaluated with eligibility determined within 60 days.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of children with parental consent to evaluate are evaluated with eligibility determined within 60 days.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of children with parental consent to evaluate are evaluated with eligibility determined within 60 days.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of children with parental consent to evaluate are evaluated with eligibility determined within 60 days.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of children with parental consent to evaluate are evaluated with eligibility determined within 60 days.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities to be described in 2005--2006 as a result of reviewing baseline data.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to description before Indicator 1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

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.

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

Percent = c divided by a – b times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

As noted in the 2003 Self-Assessment Report and Annual Performance Reports, FSM does not receive specific funding under Part C of IDEA for providing early intervention services and supports. Therefore, Indicator 12 does not apply to the FSM.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

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

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to description before Indicator 1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

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 # of youth with an IEP age 16 and above times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

NEW INDICATOR. The following design outlines general areas or tasks to be completed for gathering baseline data for this compliance requirement:

1. FSM-HESA to facilitate the development of the measurement system for addressing the IEP requirement for Indicator 13, to include:
 - Revisions to the data collection process for the measurement system in determining “coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.”
 - Provision of training and technical assistance supports to LEA special education coordinators, administrators, service providers, and LEA data clerks in data collection, reporting, and use of quality assurance and monitoring procedures to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the data.
 - Upgrade data elements of the FSM special education Student Information Tracking System (SITS) for input and maintenance, and data analysis functions.
2. FSM-HESA will report on this compliance measurement for youth with IEPs ages 16 and above. However, within the FSM-HESA transition procedures, transition continues to begin for youth with IEPs 14 years of age. FSM-HESA will monitor the transition for students with IEPs beginning at 14 years of age and for 8th graders transitioning to 9th grade.
3. FSM-HESA to develop the measurement system for determining “coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goal” to be implemented in each LEA, to include:
 - Beginning July 2005, FSM-HESA to facilitate training with LEA Special Education Coordinators and Data Clerks on the data collection procedures and updated data elements in the FSM special education Student Information Tracking System (SITS).
 - Beginning July 2005, FSM special education SITS will track IEPs for youth with disabilities ages 16 and above for appropriate statements related to “coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.”
 - Beginning August 2005, FSM-HESA to facilitate ongoing training for the LEAs on the transition procedures for monitoring and tracking “coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.”
 - Through the LEA quarterly reports, each LEA Special Education Coordinator to review and analyze the transition data and provide justification for any non-compliance with corrective action measures for meeting the requirement. The LEA quarterly reports will be submitted and reviewed by FSM-HESA for determining needed enforcement actions pursuant to the *Continuous Improvement Monitoring System*. (refer to description of System provided in Indicator 15)

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

To be included in 2005-2006 APR due in February 2007.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	No Target expected – New Indicator.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of youth aged 16 and above has an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of youth aged 16 and above has an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of youth aged 16 and above has an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of youth aged 16 and above has an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of youth aged 16 and above has an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities to be described in 2005--2006 as a result of reviewing baseline data.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to description before Indicator 1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Measurement:

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

NEW INDICATOR. The following design for gathering baseline data for this new indicator was taken from the guidance provided by the National Center on Post-School Outcomes (NCPSO):

1. The FSM Secondary Leadership Team, comprised of FSM-HESA and LEA special education coordinators and transition supervisors/teachers, to develop the post-school outcome measurement system for FSM, to include:
 - Policies and procedures to guide post-school outcome assessment and measurement practices.
 - Provision of training and technical assistance supports to administrators and service providers in outcome data collection, reporting, and use of quality assurance and monitoring procedures to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the post-school outcome data.
 - Data system elements for post-school outcome data input and maintenance, and outcome data analysis functions.
2. The FSM Secondary Leadership Team to develop measurement strategies as part of the overall post-school outcome measurement system to be implemented in each FSM state, to include:
 - Who will be included in the measurement?
 - Secondary students expected to leave this year and FSM-HESA plans to survey after they leave school.
 - What measurement tool will be used?
 - Suggested post-school outcomes process and instruments developed by the National Center on Post-School Outcomes (NCPSO).
 - Who will conduct the assessments?
 - Assigned FSM state special education personnel.
 - When will measurement occur?
 - For school year 2005-2006, using the NCPSO “exit survey” for demographic and contact information to be collected, e.g. student demographics, IEP post-secondary goals, phone/e-mail/mail for contacting student or family within one year.
 - By January 2006, FSM-HESA will convene a FSM National Secondary Leadership meeting to review and adapt exiting survey and develop procedures for implementation.
 - By February 2006, follow-up LEA support for the implementation of the survey and process.
 - By May 2006, LEAs to submit surveys results to FSM-HESA for analysis and to report findings in APR.

- o By June 2007, using the NCPSO “follow-up survey” for post-school outcome, data to be collected from students who left during the 2005-2006 school year.
 - How will data be analyzed and reported?
 - o Compilation of post-school outcome summaries by LEA to be aggregated by FSM-HESA for national reporting of the percentage 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.
3. The FSM Secondary Leadership Team to facilitate the implementation of the outcome measurement system in each LEA, to include:
- Collection, compilation, and reporting of outcomes data for improving services, as well as for national data.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Report on status based on results from “exit survey” data to be included in 2005-2006 APR due February 2007.

Post-school outcomes data to be summarized and reported in 2006-2007 APR due February 2008.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	No Target expected – New Indicator.
2006 (2006-2007)	No Target expected – New Indicator.
2007 (2007-2008)	Target to be established in 2006-2007.
2008 (2008-2009)	Target to be established in 2006-2007.
2009 (2009-2010)	Target to be established in 2006-2007.
2010 (2010-2011)	Target to be established in 2006-2007.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities to be described in 2006-2007 as a result of setting annual targets.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to description before Indicator 1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Measurement:

A. Percent of noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance made related to monitoring priority areas and indicators.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = b divided by a times 100.

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

B. Percent of noncompliance related to areas not included in the above monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:

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

Percent = b divided by a times 100.

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

C. Percent of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.) corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of agencies in which noncompliance was identified through other mechanisms.
- b. # of findings of noncompliance made.
- c. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = c divided by b times 100.

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The FSM Department of Health, Education, and Social Affairs (FSM-HESA) is the government entity (State Education Agency, SEA) responsible for the general supervision of special education and related services for children with disabilities and their families. FSM-HESA supports 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. FSM-HESA revised the monitoring system to assess compliance and performance of

each LEA based on IDEA 2004, the proposed regulations, and FSM Public Law 14-08 of June 2005. FSM Public Law 14-08 provided the amendments to FSM Public Law 8-21 of 1993 ensuring policy alignment with IDEA.

Monitoring System: Continuous Improvement

Aligned with OSEP's *Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring System* (CIFMS), the FSM *Continuous Improvement* Monitoring System includes two processes for verifying compliance and performance of each LEA utilizing the IDEA Part B State Performance Plan indicators and measurements.

1. On a quarterly basis, the four LEAs submit to FSM-HESA, the State Education Agency (SEA), a quarterly progress report that reviews fiscal, compliance, and performance data and information relevant to the IDEA Part B State Performance Plan indicators, including formal complaints, mediation, and due process requests and results. The fiscal review ensures that expenditures for the quarter are consistent with approved grant appropriation for the LEA. The compliance and performance review monitors progress made on priorities identified in the LEA's Local Performance Plan (LPP) for Special Education. Each LEA LPP responds to the FSM IDEA Part B SPP and other prioritized FSM National priorities based on the FSM National mandate for providing special education and related services. The LEA LPP is updated on an annual basis for submission to FSM-HESA for incorporation into the annual public dissemination of performance by LEAs, as mandated by IDEA. The submission of the LEA quarterly progress reports is tied to the release of their respective quarterly advice allotment of grant funds. The timely submission of the LEA's quarterly progress report, "concurring" through signature by the LEA Steering Committee Chairperson, who is the parent representative on the committee, must reflect accurate and verifiable data for FSM-HESA to authorize the LEA's quarterly advice allotment of grant funds.
2. On an annual basis, FSM-HESA, the SEA, conducts an on-site monitoring/verification visit to each LEA. The SEA monitoring team assesses the LEA's compliance with IDEA Part B requirements and verifies the effectiveness of progress made on the priorities of the LPP for Special Education. The SEA monitoring team reviews the previously submitted LEA quarterly reports as background information of the compliance and performance progress and issues identified by the LEA in preparation of the visit. During the visit, the SEA monitoring team reviews updated child and program data, conducts child record reviews, and interviews Steering Committee members, school personnel, special education staff, and parents. As a result of the team visit, FSM-HESA issues a Monitoring/Verification Report to the FSM LEA Director describing findings and corrective action requirements, including levels of intervention – incentives or sanctions – for ensuring completion of corrective action requirements, as required.

Monitoring System Instruments

As designed, the monitoring system has been revised to align with the IDEA Part B SPP indicators and other relevant FSM National priorities of FSM Public Law 14-08 for providing special education programs for children with disabilities birth – 21 and their families. The instruments used to verify compliance and performance of the LEA during the on-site visit consists of the following:

1. LEA Verification Checklist: The monitored LEA must complete the LEA Verification Checklist with current information in the following areas, referenced to related SPP indicators:
 - 1.1. Identification rate using trend data from reported 618 Child Count data, and current data of children with disabilities birth-21 served at the time of the visit. (Indicators 4, 5, 6, 11 & 13: Suspension/Expulsion, School-Age LRE, Preschool LRE, Child Find, and Secondary Transition Goals/Plans. NOTE: Secondary Transition Goals/Plans monitored beginning age 14)
 - 1.2. Description of LEA monitoring system to verify LEA procedures for implementing services according to IDEA Part B, to include interagency agreements and dispute resolution system. (Indicators 15 - 19: LEA General Supervision)
 - 1.3. Description of data collection and reporting system to assess the accuracy and reliability of data, including comparison data with general education, such as graduation and drop-out data. (Indicators 1, 2, & 20: Graduation Rates, Drop-Out Rates, and State Reported Data)
 - 1.4. Description of the assessment system to verify how students with disabilities participate and perform in the FSM National Standardized Test (NST). (Indicator 3: Assessment Data)
 - 1.5. Progress data on improved performance for LEA Determined targets in meeting related FSM IDEA Part B SPP FSM Determined targets. (Indicators 1-8, & 14: Graduation, Drop-Out, Assessment, Suspension/Expulsion, School-Age LRE, Preschool LRE, Preschool Outcomes, Parent Involvement, and Post-School Outcomes; and FSM National Priority under Early Childhood Initiative)
 - 1.6. Verification of fiscal expenditures with approved grant allocation to include verification of funded personnel assignments and qualifications. (Indicator 15: General Supervision: Grants Management & Personnel Development)

- 1.7. Description of active participation of stakeholders, especially parents, in the program review process through the implementation of the LEA Steering Committee/Advisory Panel. (Indicator 8: Parent Involvement)
2. Child Record Review: Random selection of files maintained for children with disabilities served is reviewed utilizing a review checklist covering the special education procedures for identification, referral, evaluation, eligibility, IEP development, placement determination, and exiting requirements of Part B. The review also assesses the LEA's evidence of meeting the confidentiality requirements and prior written notice to include procedural safeguards for providing special education and related services. The review is aligned with the procedures established in the revisions to the Special Education Procedural Manual completed in June 2005. The Child Record Review Checklist reviews evidence of procedural compliance through appropriate documentation following related IDEA Part B SPP Indicators and IDEA Part B requirements:
 - 2.1. Identification: Screening activity for children with disabilities age birth-21 to be identified, located, and evaluated. The Local Interagency Agreement has served as the basis for Child Find and Public Awareness activities for young children with disabilities.
 - 2.2. Referral, Evaluation, & Eligibility: Referral for initial evaluation, re-evaluation, and student entering with an IEP from another jurisdiction. Evaluation procedures to include disability conditions and multidisciplinary assessment procedures and instruments. Eligibility determination based on child's school performance problem due to one of the disability conditions and having an adverse effect on the education performance where the child is in need of special education and related services.
 - 2.3. IEP Development, Review, & Revision: Initial and review of IEP, to include meeting participants, present levels of performance/unique needs, annual goals and short-term objectives, special education and related services, supplementary aids and services, modifications and supports, participation in nation-wide assessment, transition service needs and services (for youth with disabilities beginning at age 14), projected date of services, transfer of rights procedures, and consideration of special factors.
 - 2.4. Placement Determination: Placement determination based on LRE and the continuum of alternative placements.
 - 2.5. Exiting Procedures: Procedures for "exiters" based on 618 Data Table 4 definitions.
 - 2.6. Procedural Safeguards: Prior written notice and procedural safeguard notice procedures.
 - 2.7. Confidentiality: Confidentiality requirements for maintenance of child records, procedures for accessing child records, and procedures for use of personally identifiable information.
3. Personnel and Parent Interviews: Verification of procedures and services provided in the LEAs is conducted through interviews with LEA Steering Committee members, special education staff, school personnel, and parents. A standard set of questions is asked of selected members, personnel, and parents to review their understanding of the special education procedures and the impact of services for improving results for children with disabilities and their families. Selected parents are representatives on the LEA Steering Committee to allow for gathering feedback on the active participation of parents on committees and councils for special education related activities.

Monitoring System Enforcement Actions: Incentives and Sanctions

The monitoring system includes the following "enforcement actions" to ensure timely correction of identified non-compliance and incentives for progress on prioritized improvement strategies. Notices of the consequences are provided as a result of the LEA quarterly progress report and expenditure report review and/or the on-site monitoring/verification visit:

1. Incentives
 - 1.1 Level 1: Commendation Letter. FSM-HESA provides a *Letter of Commendation* to the LEA Director with a copy to the LEA Special Education Program Coordinator and LEA Steering Committee Chairperson commending the program for full compliance with Part B requirements. LEA will also be recognized in the FSM-HESA quarterly newsletter.
 - 1.2 Level 2: State-Level Support. FSM-HESA allocates fiscal resources as an incentive for complying LEAs. FSM-HESA will recognize one teacher from the fully complying LEA and will support that teacher to participate in a regional disability-related conference or workshop. The selected individual will receive a certificate of recognition from the Secretary of FSM-HESA or the President of FSM.
 - 1.3 Level 3: Individual Service Provider Incentives. FSM-HESA recommends the LEA allocate fiscal resources to help provide incentives (e.g. salary adjustment, participation in training activities, as appropriate to the respective LEA). Recommendation to include establishing a system/criteria to be used in all LEAs for selection of the individual service provider (e.g. Recommendation from school principal, peer, parent, Director, and/or Special Education Program Coordinator). Individual selected will be recognized as the

LEA teacher of the year and will be supported to participate in a regional disability-related conference or workshop.

2. Sanctions

- 2.1 Level 1: Letter of Concern. FSM-HESA (the SEA) provides a *Letter of Concern* to the LEA Director with a copy to the LEA Special Education Program Coordinator citing non-compliance findings during the monitoring and verification of data 10 calendar days after the findings from the LEA quarterly progress report review and/or the on-site monitoring/ verification visit. Corrective actions or practices required of the LEA will be included in the *Letter of Concern* to ensure that non-compliance areas are corrected in a timely manner. The LEA must develop a corrective action plan and submit to the Secretary of FSM-HESA with a copy to the Executive Director of FSM-HESA Special Education Program within 30 calendar days. The LEA will be allowed up to 1 calendar year to correct noncompliance/s from the date of the identification. The plan shall be incorporated into the reporting mechanism through the LEA quarterly progress report to FSM-HESA. A final report of correction must be submitted to the Secretary with copy to the Executive Director no later than 30 calendar days after the 1 calendar year time period for correction from identification. Verification of correction will be conducted to confirm correction of noncompliance/s by an on-site visit or through the LEA quarterly progress report review, as appropriate. An LEA failing to address non-compliance areas will be placed on "*Probationary status.*"
- 2.2 Level 2: Probationary Status. A LEA on *Probationary Status* shall report progress on strategies identified in the corrective action plan in the LEA quarterly progress report or shall be subject to withholding of quarterly advice allotment of grant funds. If the LEA does not show significant progress each quarter towards correction of noncompliance, the LEA will be labeled "*At-Risk.*"
- 2.3 Level 3: At-Risk Status. A LEA on *At-Risk Status* is required to demonstrate satisfactory progress with constant and immediate supervision from the Secretary of FSM-HESA or the Executive Director of FSM-HESA Special Education Program. The non-compliance report and findings shall be transmitted to the Office of the Governor of the island state for further review, recommendations, and solutions for correcting the cited noncompliance areas.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Measurement A: Identification & Correction of Noncompliance related to Monitoring Priorities

FSM-HESA conducted an on-site monitoring/verification visit to Pohnpei in December 2004 and Yap in February 2005. The monitoring/verification reviews followed the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) Cluster Areas. As a result of the visits, FSM-HESA issued a Monitoring/Verification Report to Pohnpei's LEA and Yap's LEA listing the findings of noncompliance, areas for improvement, and requirements for corrective actions to be corrected within one year of identification. Both LEAs were instructed to update their Improvement Plans to address the noncompliance and issues raised during the visit, as well as to report progress regarding required corrections and improvement in the LEA quarterly reports.

As outlined in the FSM *Continuous Improvement* Monitoring System, the LEA Final Report of corrections to identified noncompliances will be submitted to FSM-HESA, at the latest, 30 days after the 1 calendar year from identification/on-site visit. For Pohnpei, it is understood that correction of noncompliances need to be made by December 2005 with the Final Report submitted to FSM-HESA by January 2006. For Yap, the noncompliances must be corrected by February 2006, with the Final Report submitted to FSM-HESA by March 2006.

The format of the review process during the time of FSM-HESA's monitoring/verification visits followed the CIMP Cluster Areas. However, to address Measurement A of this Indicator, the following Table organized the previously reported Cluster Area findings identified in the FSM-HESA issued Monitoring Reports by the SPP monitoring priority areas and indicators. As shown, 1 of the 3 monitoring priority areas was identified as a noncompliance area for Pohnpei; while all 3 areas were identified for Yap. The review of evidence of correction to the identified noncompliances will be reported in the 2005-2006 Annual Performance Report.

Monitoring Area	Indicator #	Identified Noncompliance	Pohnpei Yes or No?	Yap Yes or No?
General Supervision/ Transition	13	Lack of evidence of transition statements/services in the IEPs based on file reviews.	No	Yes
General Supervision	15	Lack of LEA monitoring system.	No	Yes
General Supervision	16, 17	Lack of evidence of full implementation of complaints, due process system, to include awareness of local operational and documentation	Yes	Yes

		procedures.		
--	--	-------------	--	--

Measurement B: Identification & Correction of Noncompliance related to Areas Not Included in Measurement “A” Monitoring Areas

The format of the monitoring/verification review process during the time of FSM-HESA’s monitoring/verification visit to Pohnpei in December 2004 and Yap in February 2005 followed the CIMP Cluster Areas. To address Measurement B of this Indicator, the following Table organized the previously reported Cluster Area findings identified in the FSM-HESA issued Monitoring Reports by “other areas” not included in the SPP monitoring priority areas and indicators identified in Measurement A. As shown, 2 of the 5 areas were identified as noncompliance areas for Pohnpei; while 3 of the 5 areas were identified for Yap. The review of evidence of correction to the identified noncompliances will be reported in the 2005-2006 Annual Performance Report.

Other Areas NOT in Measurement A	Identified Noncompliance	Pohnpei Yes or No?	Yap Yes or No?
Child Find	Inadequate Child Find and Public Awareness activities resulting in a significant drop in Child Count.	No	Yes
IEP in Effect	IEPs not updated on an annual basis.	No	Yes
Personnel	FSM minimum teacher certification requirements not met by all special education teachers.	No	Yes
Personnel Data System	Insufficient personnel data system for tracking additional personnel needs based on identified student service needs.	Yes	No
Student Data System	Inconsistent data management system for collecting, compiling, and reporting LEA data, to include individual school and LEA analysis of data for system improvement strategies.	Yes	No

Measurement C: Identification & Correction of Noncompliance through Other Mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediation, etc.)

As reported in Attachment 1, FSM-HESA did not receive any complaint and due process requests in 2004-2005.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

General Supervision: Identification and Timely Correction of Noncompliance, OSEP Response Letter, September 22, 2005

The OSEP letter, dated September 22, 2005, responded to the FFY 2003 Part B APR. OSEP required FSM-HESA to include in its SPP evidence demonstrating how its monitoring procedures ensure the correction of noncompliance identified through monitoring within one year of identification, as required by 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E).

As shared in the Overview section, the “Sanctions” component of the *Continuous Improvement* Monitoring System had been updated to ensure compliance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E). Evidence of corrections for the two FSM LEAs monitored during 2004-2005 will be reviewed in 2005-2006, as the first LEA on-site monitoring/verification visit conducted was in December 2004.

FSM-HESA will conduct monitoring/verification visits to Kosrae and Chuuk in 2005-2006. Findings of noncompliances will be reported in the 2005-2006 FSM-HESA Annual Performance Report.

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.
2006 (2006-2007)	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.

2007 (2007-2008)	General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects all noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification 100% of the time.
2008 (2008-2009)	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.
2009 (2009-2010)	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.
2010 (2010-2011)	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.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

1. Continue implementation of the FSM-HESA *Continuous Improvement* Monitoring System, including the review of completion/resolution timeline requirements for complaints, mediation, and due process hearing requests, through LEA quarterly reports and fiscal reports to FSM-HESA and the FSM-HESA on-site monitoring/verification visits, as scheduled during the school year.
 - 1.1 Timeline: Quarterly for LEA reports. Annually for monitoring/verification visits, with report findings disseminated to all LEAs. Analysis of the reports will assist FSM-HESA with prioritizing nation-wide targeted improvement activities for subsequent years.
 - 1.2 Resource: Technical support from appropriate IHE or technical assistance provider.

2. Facilitate LEA training for staff and parents regarding the procedural safeguards notice, with particular focus on the local operational and documentation procedures for full implementation, including the review of the timeline requirements for the resolution of complaints, mediation, and due process hearing requests.
 - 2.1 Timeline: Annually.
 - 2.2 Resource: LEA Parent Organizations, and as needed, technical support from appropriate IHE or technical assistance provider to facilitate a “train-the-trainers” session with selected LEA teams to ensure local capacity for continued training session in subsequent years.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to description before Indicator 1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

No signed written complaints received for this reporting period.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

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.
2006 (2006-2007)	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.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
2008 (2008-2009)	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.
2009 (2009-2010)	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.
2010 (2010-2011)	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.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Refer to Indicator 15, General Supervision, for improvement activities.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to description before Indicator 1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

No due process hearing requests received for this reporting period.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

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.
2006 (2006-2007)	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.
2007 (2007-2008)	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.
2008 (2008-2009)	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.
2009 (2009-2010)	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.
2010 (2010-2011)	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.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Refer to Indicator 15, General Supervision, for improvement activities.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to description before Indicator 1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

New Indicator. FSM-HESA to update dispute resolution procedures to include the provision of hearing resolutions. Parent and staff training to follow in each FSM state to ensure full implementation.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	No Target expected – New Indicator.
2006 (2006-2007)	Target to be established in 2005-2006, as appropriate.
2007 (2007-2008)	Target to be established in 2005-2006, as appropriate.
2008 (2008-2009)	Target to be established in 2005-2006, as appropriate.
2009 (2009-2010)	Target to be established in 2005-2006, as appropriate.
2010 (2010-2011)	Target to be established in 2005-2006, as appropriate.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to description before Indicator 1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

No due process hearing requests or mediation requests received for this reporting period.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Unable to set target. No requests for mediation.
2006 (2006-2007)	Target to be established in 2005-2006, as appropriate.
2007 (2007-2008)	Target to be established in 2005-2006, as appropriate.
2008 (2008-2009)	Target to be established in 2005-2006, as appropriate.
2009 (2009-2010)	Target to be established in 2005-2006, as appropriate.
2010 (2010-2011)	Target to be established in 2005-2006, as appropriate.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Refer to Indicator 15, General Supervision, for improvement activities.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to description before Indicator 1.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

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 accuracy).

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The FSM has targeted timely collection and reporting of accurate 618 data and annual performance reports as a priority area for improvement. The four FSM LEAs compile and submit 618 data reports, annual performance reports, to include expenditure reports which are reviewed, verified, and compiled into one FSM SEA report for submission to OSEP. As reported in the FSM 2003-2004 APR, FSM had developed and implemented a data system to support this priority area.

The FSM student and personnel data system is called the FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS). SITS is a relational database, using Microsoft Access (Office 2003 version), designed to track special education students through the entire cycle of special education services. SITS provides daily case management information at the LEA levels for tracking students through the identification and placement process. It is a web-based data system, which periodically updates LEA level data into an SEA database located at the FSM-HESA Special Education Program Office. SITS provides both the LEAs and the SEA levels to evaluate progress in meeting special education requirements. It provides summary data for required 618 reported data.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Measurement A: Submitted Reports on or before Due Date

The Table below lists the 2004-2005 618 reporting requirements, due dates, and "email" dates. As shown, FSM-HESA met the "timely" requirement for 3 of the 5 reports for the reporting year.

	618 Reports	Due Date	Emailed to WESTAT
2004-2005	Child Count & Placement	February 1, 2005	February 7, 2005
2004-2005	Personnel, Exiting, Discipline	November 1, 2005	October 28, 2005

In addition, previous Annual Performance Reports were submitted "on time" based on agreed upon due dates.

Measurement B: Mechanism for Ensuring Accuracy

The FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS) is being fully implemented by FSM-HESA with links to each FSM LEA for data input, correction, and analysis. The fields in the system include the following:

Student Data

- State Demographics: Municipality, school

- Student Demographics: Name, date of birth, ethnic identity, primary language, address/contact information, status (active, pending)
- Case Management Assignment
- Special Education Process timelines: Identification, referral, evaluation, eligibility, IEP development, Placement determination
- Assessment data/information
- Related services needed and services not delivered
- Exit information following 618 definitions

Personnel Data

- State Demographics: Municipality, school
- Personnel Type: Administrator, teacher, related service, non-professional, etc. (following 618 descriptions)
- Position Title and Type
- Level of Education
- Certification
- Age of Students Served

SITS is able to generate all 618 data tables and reports. The system also has the capacity to disaggregate data to provide program managers/Special Education Coordinators with school specific information on active and pending cases. The system is connected to all 4 FSM LEAs for easy access for data input and downloading for verification. To ensure confidentiality, security through password protection has been installed. Three levels of access have been implemented:

- Level 1 for School Sites: Schools able to upload and update student data to the program coordinator at any time.
- Level 2 for LEA Special Education Coordinators: Coordinators able to access respective LEA files for easy data verification and reporting. School personnel not able to access nation-wide information.
- Level 3 for System Administrator at FSM-HESA: Administrator able to access Levels 1 & 2 with the ability to generate national data for reporting, such as 618 data, and systemic improvement.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

As noted under Measurement A, FSM-HESA was not 100% in compliance with “timely submission” of required reports. The two 618 reports for Child count and Environment due February 1st were submitted on February 7, 2005 via e-mail to WESTAT, as per instructions. In addition, during the SPP Input Session held November 3, 4, & 7, 2005, it was discovered that the reported drop-outs (exit data) and suspensions (discipline data) submitted on October 28, 2005 would need to be corrected by one of the LEAs. Kosrae’s drop-out data should have been more than originally reported and there shouldn’t have been any reported “greater than 10 days” suspensions. As the stakeholders reviewed the baseline data, a series of questions were raised regarding the accuracy of the data. Kosrae verified and confirmed the numbers, which required corrections to the submitted 618 data. This was noted in Indicator 2, Drop-Out Rates, and Indicator 4, Suspension/Expulsion Data, in the baseline discussion sections.

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.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

1. Facilitate upgrades to the FSM SITS to include: (A) the interface of special education data with the overall FSM-HESA Education Management Information System (EMIS) to ensure comparison data for related indicators; (B) additional fields and report summaries to address all of the SPP indicators, especially for the “new” indicators; (C) monitoring data for on-site visits. Upgrades to include training for LEA staff for implementation.

- 1.1 Timeline: Beginning 2005-2006 with annual upgrades and verification of accuracy in data collected through the annual FSM-HESA monitoring/verification visits. Analysis of data and monitoring reports will assist FSM-HESA with prioritizing nation-wide targeted improvement activities for subsequent years.
- 2.2 Resources: Technical support from appropriate Institution of Higher Education (IHE) or other technical assistance provider for data system upgrades; FSM-HESA Evaluation Specialist for EMIS implementation.

Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
Complaints, Mediations, Resolution Sessions, and Due Process Hearings

SECTION A: Signed, written complaints	
(1) Signed, written 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	0
(a) Mediations related to due process	0
(i) Mediation agreements	0
(b) Mediations not related to due process	0
(i) Mediation agreements	0
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	0

SECTION C: Hearing requests	
(3) Hearing requests total	0
(3.1) Resolution sessions	No 04-05 Data
(a) Settlement agreements	No 04-05 Data
(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