

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) for Indicators 4b, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 18 due to the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) by February 1, 2007. These indicators were identified as new indicators in the original SPP submitted December 2005. In addition, FSM-HESA, with stakeholder input, developed a distribution plan to meet the public dissemination requirement.

As instructed by OSEP, at minimum, each entity is required to involve the State Advisory Panel in the development of the SPP. In the FSM, each LEA has an advisory panel for special education that has, in previous years, served as the 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. The FSM National Steering/SPP Committee is comprised of the LEA Advisory Panel Chairperson, who is a parent of a child with a disability, the LEA special education coordinator, and the FSM-HESA Special Education Program. As described in previous reports, the FSM National Steering/SPP 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 therefore meets the minimum requirement for "broad stakeholder input" by involving the FSM National Steering/SPP Committee, as well as the LEA advisory panels representing the State Advisory Panel.

FSM-HESA obtained "broad stakeholder" input in the development of "measurable and rigorous" targets for the new SPP indicators with baseline data for the 2005-2006 reporting period. Indicators 4b, 9, and 10 review disproportionality data for race and ethnicity. Given that the majority of FSM's population, including FSM's student population, is predominantly "Asian/Pacific Islander," these indicators do not apply to FSM and will not require the development of targets. Indicators 7 and 14, preschool and post-school outcomes, require only "entry" data for preschool and "leaver" data/process for post-school and will not require the development of targets until 2006-2007. Indicators 11 and 13 are compliance measures of 100% performance target for each year, with the development of improvement activities. Indicator 8, Parent Involvement, requires targets and improvement activities. Indicator 18, Hearing Resolution, requires targets and improvement activities only if the 2005-2006 baseline includes 10 or more hearing resolutions. FSM did not report any hearing requests; therefore, targets are not required for Indicator 18.

BROAD STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

Input Sessions for the Updated SPP included:

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

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

PUBLIC DISSEMINATION PLAN

With stakeholder input, FSM-HESA has designed a distribution plan to meet the State Performance Plan (SPP) public dissemination requirement. FSM-HESA will disseminate the updated FSM IDEA Part B SPP utilizing the following process:

1. By February 9, 2007, upon submission of the FSM IDEA Part B SPP for Indicators 4b, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 18 to the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs, FSM-HESA will post the report on the FSM National Government Website: <http://www.fsmpio.fm/departments.htm> (select "Department of Health, Education, and Social Affairs (HESA)"), which will include the FSM SPP submitted in December 2005 and updated in January 2006. 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 February 22, 2007, a letter from the FSM-HESA Secretary to parents of children and youth with disabilities will be distributed via the Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Education and Special Education Program. The letter will provide an explanation of the purpose for the updated 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 February 22, 2007, 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 February 22, 2007, a summary of the FSM IDEA Part B SPP with contact information for obtaining a full copy of the plan and the updated plan will be announced, through the LEAs, in the local radio stations, as appropriate.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to page 1 of this SPP for development description.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Measurement:

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Description provided in SPP submitted on December 2, 2005.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

As reported in previous Annual Performance Reports and reported 618 Child Count Data, the majority of children with disabilities in the FSM in 2005-2006 continues to fall under the "Asian/Pacific Islander" category, consistent with the school and community populations. Therefore, Indicator 4b does not apply to FSM.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	A. 0% of districts/LEAs identified by FSM as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. B. Not applicable to FSM.
2006 (2006-2007)	A. 0% of districts/LEAs identified by FSM as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. B. Not applicable to FSM.
2007 (2007-2008)	A. 0% of districts/LEAs identified by FSM as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. B. Not applicable to FSM.
2008 (2008-2009)	A. 0% of districts/LEAs identified by FSM as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. B. Not applicable to FSM.
2009 (2009-2010)	A. 0% of districts/LEAs identified by FSM as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. B. Not applicable to FSM.
2010 (2010-2011)	A. 0% of districts/LEAs identified by FSM as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. B. Not applicable to FSM.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to page 1 of this SPP for development description.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

Measurement:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):

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

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

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):

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

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

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

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

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

- preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Through technical assistance from the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC) and support from the University of Guam CEDDERS, the FSM HESA-Special Education Program developed the Early Childhood Outcomes Measurement System to assess, monitor, and report on the three child outcomes identified by OSEP. The three early childhood outcomes are:

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

In October 2005, a 2-day meeting was held with early childhood teams (ECT) from each FSM state. The composition of the ECT from each state included a Head Start representative, early childhood special education supervisors/coordinators, and related service assistants. The purpose of the meeting was to provide an overview of the three early childhood outcomes and to gather input on a process for collecting, analyzing, and reporting child outcomes. In addition, the ECT reviewed the requirements for Part B Indicator 7 and clearly defined what is meant by each outcome. As a result of the meeting, the ECT developed next steps, which included scheduling meetings with early childhood staff when they return to their FSM state to review the three child outcomes, to ensure that these outcomes are culturally relevant, and to begin translation into their native languages.

In April 2006, a meeting was held at the Early Childhood Outcomes Conference in Albuquerque, New Mexico for the Pacific Entities, sponsored by NECTAC, to review the process for assessing child development that was culturally appropriate and culturally competent. As a result of the meeting, NECTAC shared the crosswalk that was done by the ECO staff on the 2002 Micronesian Inventory of Development (MID). As per the analysis, the 2002 MID responded to outcomes 2 and 3. However, additional items were needed for outcome 1. During this meeting, it was shared by FSM participants that there were different versions of the MID and that the latest update was completed in 2004 by Pohnpei State with additional subtests added. The MID is an assessment tool that is used to monitor progress of what children 3 to 5 years of age should know and be able to do.

In May 2006, the ECT representing each FSM State reviewed the 2004 version of the MID. The ECT reviewed each item carefully, revised several items to ensure that it was culturally appropriate for each FSM state, and completed an updated crosswalk with the new version of the document, currently referred to as the "Federated States of Micronesia Inventory of Development (FSM-ID)". The ECT agreed that the FSM-ID did in fact respond to all three outcomes and will be used as one source of information, along with parent observation/input, teacher observation, service provider reports and other assessment reports used in rating the performance of children. During this meeting, early childhood outcomes procedures were developed to ensure continuity and consistency of assessing and collecting child outcomes across all four FSM states.

As indicated in the FSM early childhood outcomes guidelines, there will be two measurement points of data collection. The first measurement point will be conducted upon entry into the program. The child's team (parents, teachers, and related service providers) will assess the child using the FSM-ID and other sources of information such as, parent interview/input, other assessment information, and teacher or provider observation, etc. Based on all the data collected, the child's team will determine the overall rating of the child based on the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Child Outcome Summary Form (COSF) using the ECO 7-point rating scale. The second measurement point of data collection will occur at "exit" or prior to the child exiting the program for one of the following reasons: to transition to first grade; leaving

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

island; or other exiting reasons. The child’s team will complete the Child Outcome Exit Summary Form.

For the purpose of this reporting year 2005-2006, all preschoolers with IEPs who will have at least one year of special education early childhood services at “exit” from the program were identified to participate in the entry data collection.

In December 2006, an FSM Early Childhood Outcome Meeting was held to finalize the FSM-ID and to review a process for analyzing and reporting child outcomes. During this meeting, each FSM state verified the results of the early childhood outcomes report that was submitted to the FSM National. Furthermore, training was conducted on the ECO Tutor Excel Program and the FSM states inputted data into the *ECO Excel COSF to OSEP Calculator Analytic Program* that was tailored for each FSM state to monitor and track early childhood outcomes for each preschooler with an IEP.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

As of June 2006, 51 early childhood outcomes entry data was compiled from each of the FSM States. As a result of the data collected, 51 preschool children with IEPs participated in the entry data collection for 2005-2006. As indicated in the FSM National Data below, for early childhood outcome 1, 57% or 29/51 of the preschoolers demonstrated skills or behaviors related to positive social emotional skills including social emotional skills appropriate to his or her age across a variety of settings and situations and 43% or 22/51 preschoolers demonstrated skills or behaviors at entry level below their same age peers. For early childhood outcome 2, 69% or 35/51 preschoolers demonstrated skills or behaviors related to acquiring and using knowledge and skills appropriate to his or her age across a variety of settings and situations, and 31% or 16/51 preschoolers demonstrated skills or behaviors related to acquiring and using knowledge and skills at entry level below their same age peers. For early childhood outcome 3, 67% or 34/51 preschoolers demonstrated skills or behaviors related to taking appropriate action to meet their needs appropriate to his or her age across a variety of settings and situations, and 33% or 17/51 preschoolers demonstrated skills or behaviors related to acquiring and using knowledge and skills at entry level below their same age peers.

FSM NATIONAL DATA FOR 2005-2006

Outcomes	Total=51 Assessed using the FSM-ID	
	% (#) Below Age	% (#) At Age
1. Positive Social-Emotional Skills	57% (29/51)	43% (22/51)
2. Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills	69% (35/51)	31% (16/51)
3. Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet their Needs	67% (34/51)	33% (17/51)

The following Tables represent data by individual FSM States:

CHUUK STATE

Entry data for Preschool Outcomes, as of June 30, 2006

Outcomes	Total=9 Assessed using the FSM-ID*	
	% (#) Below Age	% (#) At Age
1. Positive Social-Emotional Skills	33% (3/9)	67% (6/9)
2. Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills	89% (8/9)	11% (1/9)
3. Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet their Needs	22% (2/9)	78% (7/9)

*Data verified by Chuuk State participants at the December 2006 Meeting.

KOSRAE STATE

Entry data for Preschool Outcomes, as of June 30, 2006

Outcomes	Total=8 Assessed using the FSM-ID**	
	% (#) Below Age	% (#) At Age
1. Positive Social-Emotional Skills	50% (4/8)	50% (4/8)
2. Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills	63% (5/8)	37% (3/8)
3. Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet their Needs	75% (6/8)	25% (2/8)

**Data verified by Kosrae State participants at the December 2006 Meeting.

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

POHNPEI STATE

Entry data for Preschool Outcomes, as of June 30, 2006

Outcomes	Total=28 Assessed using the FSM-ID***	
	% (#) Below Age	% (#) At Age
1. Positive Social-Emotional Skills	57% (16/28)	43% (12/28)
2. Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills	61% (17/28)	39% (11/28)
3. Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet their Needs	71% (20/28)	29% (8/28)

***Data verified by Pohnpei State participants at the December 2006 Meeting.

YAP STATE

Entry data for Preschool Outcomes, as of June 30, 2006

Outcomes	Total=6 Assessed using the FSM-ID****	
	% (#) Below Age	% (#) At Age
1. Positive Social-Emotional Skills	100% (6/6)	0% (0/6)
2. Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills	83% (5/6)	17% (1/6)
3. Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet their Needs	100% (6/6)	0% (0/6)

****Data provided by Yap State participants at the December 2006 Meeting.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Preschool outcomes “exit” data utilizing ECO’s COSF form and process will be gathered in 2006-2007 to establish FSM’s baseline for this indicator.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator.
2006 (2006-2007)	Targets to be established with baseline data.
2007 (2007-2008)	
2008 (2008-2009)	
2009 (2009-2010)	
2010 (2010-2011)	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

To develop improvement activities when baseline data available in 2006-2007.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to page 1 of this SPP for development description.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

In October 2005, Early Childhood Teams from each of the FSM States were provided an orientation on Indicator 8: Parent Involvement, and the need to gather parent input. During this 2-day meeting, participants reviewed the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) survey and discussed other types of parent surveys that were conducted in their FSM state.

FSM HESA adapted the ECO survey and decided to pilot the survey as a means of collecting information from parents on the cultural appropriateness of the survey items and to gather input on the process for collecting and disseminating parent input from a wider representation that included parent members from each FSM State. With feedback from each FSM state, it was agreed that the adapted survey would be distributed during FSM's annual parent/consumer conference. During the FSM Parent & Consumer Conference: "*Accept and Respect Everyone's Uniqueness*" held on August 2-5, 2006 in Yap State, parents were asked to complete the FSM Family Outcomes survey and provide feedback on the process and survey items. (refer to **attached Parent Involvement Survey Summary, August 2006**, for the description of the survey completed, including the items responded to.)

Baseline Data for 2005-2006:

During the September 2006 and January 2007 FSM National Steering/SPP Committee meetings, FSM-HESA facilitated a review of the survey results from the August 2006 conference. In the January 2007 meeting, the committee recommended FSM-HESA use Survey Item P to respond to the measurement requirement for this indicator. Thirty-nine percent (39%) or twelve out of thirty-one parents reported schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. The reason for selecting one item from the survey was because the committee members felt that it showed the number of "respondents." Other methods for reporting the data, such as the mean or average of the responses or the median or middle percentage, were discussed.

Of the 35 surveys completed during the conference, 31 parents completed item P. Twelve of the thirty-one parents representing **39% of the respondents indicated that the school encouraged them to be actively involved in their child's education.** (Refer to attached summary: "Indicator 8: Parent Involvement Survey SUMMARY, August 2006")

Additional parent involvement activities were reviewed from each FSM state reports and other sources. In the August 2006 FSM JEMCO 20 Education Indicators Report, disseminated throughout the FSM as part of its U.S. Department of Interior Education Sector Grant (ESG) program, information to stakeholders on the status and progress of education was reported for the 20 Education Indicators. JEMCO Indicator 18 provided data on the number of parent involvement activities that occurred each year by school and

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

average of parents participating. In an effort to address parent involvement, the report noted the following: Chuuk State indicated a high number of parent activities with a low participation rate. Accuracy of this data has not been verified. Additionally, there was no data available from Yap State on this indicator.

STATE	# Activities	# Parents Participating	Average
Chuuk	3082	1540	0.5
Kosrae	65	8871	134.9
Pohnpei	176	7512	42.5
Yap	0	0	0
FSM	3323	17923	5.4

**Data Source: FSM JEMCO 20 Education, August 2006

Discussion of Baseline Data:

As reviewed in the attached August 2006 Survey Summary, the FSM Family Outcome survey adapted from the ECO Family Outcome Survey was piloted with a total of 151 participants representing all four FSM states in attendance. Sixty-seven (67) or 44% were parents of children with disabilities, 9 or 6% were individuals with disabilities (consumers), and 75 or 50% were service providers.

Of the 67 parents in attendance, **35 or 52% completed the survey**. Of the 35 who completed the survey, 2 or 5% were from Chuuk State, 3 or 9% were from Kosrae, 3 or 9% were from Pohnpei, and 27 or 77% were from Yap. The FSM Family Outcomes Survey was divided into topical areas with two or three questions asked for each area. Parents were asked to respond to each question by checking a “rating” that best described their perception or understanding of the question related to the topical area. The **range of possible responses** were from 1 (low) to 4 (high) as follows:

- 1 = No understanding or beginning to understand the item asked about;
- 2 = Some understanding or progress related to the item asked about;
- 3 = A lot, but not quite enough, of an understanding of the item asked about; and
- 4 = Confidence in understanding or progress made in the item asked about.

Since this was a pilot activity, the completion of the FSM Family Outcomes Survey was limited to those in attendance at the conference. Given the low numbers of participants in the conference from Chuuk, Kosrae, and Pohnpei, the following survey summary therefore represents the total perception from the respondents and do not necessarily represent each FSM state’s parent perception. However, as a collective accounting of parent perception in the FSM, the summary data will be used as FSM’s baseline data for “parent involvement” to address FSM’s State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator #8 for the 2005-2006 reporting period.

In addition, FSM-HESA reviewed the data from the other survey items and will use the results to document training needs to support families such as training on parent rights, behavior strategies, and development milestones of children. Furthermore, the survey items indicated that public awareness information is needed on the types of services available to include parent advocacy groups.

During the Early Childhood meeting held in December 2006, participants reviewed SPP Indicator #8: Parent Involvement Indicator measurement requirements and the results of the completed August 2006 parent survey. Feedback from participants on “next steps” and considerations for improving the survey process included:

- Survey all parents for the four FSM states.
- Conducted survey by the end of school year – May of each year.
- Written survey okay providing there’s consideration for verbal vernacular translations as needed.
- Review each survey item to ensure that it measures what’s needed to respond to the indicator.
- Consideration should be made for those parents who are also service providers. Can they provide just a parent perspective?

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

Information from this parent feedback session held in December will be used to develop improvement activities. During the January 2007 FSM National Steering/SPP committee meeting, the stakeholders identified the following “measurable and rigorous” targets for the SPP:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator.
2006 (2006-2007)	45% of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.
2007 (2007-2008)	60% of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.
2008 (2008-2009)	75% of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.
2009 (2009-2010)	90% of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.
2010 (2010-2011)	95% of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

With input from the FSM National Steering/SPP Committee, the following improvement activities have been identified to support the development and implementation of a system-wide parent/family survey system, as well as increased knowledge and skills of parents and family members for improving results for children with disabilities:

1. The LEA Advisory Council, comprised of parent representatives from each FSM State, will review and revise, as needed, the FSM Family Survey with translations into the vernacular languages.
 - 1.1 Timeline: Annual
 - 1.2 Resources: LEA Advisory Council, Special Education Coordinators
2. By the end of May each year, the FSM Family Survey will be disseminated to all parents of students with IEPs.
 - 2.1 Timelines: Annually
 - 2.2 Resources: FSM State Special Education Coordinators and Parent Organizations
3. A variety of methods for gathering parent input will be developed and implemented as a means of gaining greater understanding of parents’ perception, such as parent forums, parent focus groups, and the parent conference.
 - 3.1 Timeline: Annually
 - 3.2 Resources: Parent Advocacy Groups, Special Education Programs, and Technical Assistance Providers
4. FSM-HESA and each LEA Special Education Program will facilitate parent workshops that promote partnerships between schools and families to improve program services and results for children with disabilities.
 - 4.1 Timeline: At least Annually
 - 4.2 Resources: FSM State Parent Organizations and SEA SPP Steering Committee

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to page 1 of this SPP for development description.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Measurement:

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

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

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:

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

As reported in previous Annual Performance Reports and reported 618 Child Count Data, the majority of children with disabilities in the FSM in 2005-2006 continues to fall under the "Asian/Pacific Islander" category, consistent with the school and community populations. Therefore, Indicator 9 does not apply to FSM.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator. Indicator not applicable to FSM based on ethnic distribution reported.
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 page 1 of this SPP for development description.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

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

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

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:

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

As reported in previous Annual Performance Reports and reported 618 Child Count Data, the majority of children with disabilities in the FSM in 2005-2006 continues to fall under the “Asian/Pacific Islander” category, consistent with the school and community populations. Therefore, Indicator 10 does not apply to FSM.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator. Indicator not applicable to FSM based on ethnic distribution reported.
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 page 1 of this SPP for development description.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Measurement:

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

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

FSM-HESA facilitated the revisions to the data collection procedures that take into account the “date of receipt” of parental consent as the start of the 60-day timeline. Following the Handbook for the Delivery of Special Education procedures, the data elements for tracking of procedural timeline dates have been incorporated into the FSM Special Education Student Information Tracking System (SITS) for input and maintenance, and data analysis. Training activities have been conducted with the FSM Local Education Agency (LEA) Data Clerks on the data collection procedures and updated data elements in the FSM SITS, with the system scheduled to be fully operational during the 2006-2007 reporting year.

Through the LEA quarterly reports, each LEA Special Education Coordinator reviews and analyzes the 60-day timeline data providing justification for any non-compliance with corrective action measures for meeting the requirement. The LEA quarterly reports are submitted and reviewed by FSM-HESA for determining needed enforcement actions pursuant to the updated *Continuous Improvement* Monitoring System. An annual review of performance with this compliance indicator is conducted through the development of each LEA Local Performance Plan, which serves as the annual report compiling all progress data from the reporting year’s quarterly reports.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006)

Following the measurement requirement for this indicator, the following Table shows data collected for reporting period July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006:

Measurement Requirement

a.	b.	c.	
# of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	# determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).	# determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).	Percent = [(b + c) divided by (a)] times 100
107*	0	102	$\frac{0 + 102}{107} = .945 \times 100 = 95\%$
			95%

*Data from Chuuk State LEA not reported for this reporting period.

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

The 5 students not accounted for in the performance data include 3 students determined eligible for special education services, but with evaluation completed over the 60-day timeline by 16 days, 18 days, and over 60 days beyond the 60-day timeline. The other 2 students not accounted for continue to be pending completion of evaluation report. The reasons for the delay were noted as a program delay due to delays in the educational diagnostician completing assessments.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Although FSM's performance was at 95%, FSM is still in noncompliance with this indicator. In addition, Chuuk State was the only FSM State LEA that did not provide accurate data. The breakdown by FSM state LEA reported percentage and number of parent permission "received" and evaluation completed within 60 days for a total of 107 included:

- Chuuk State: ---- (Inaccurate data reported)
- Kosrae State: 94% (51/54 completed within 60-day timeline)
- Pohnpei State: 96% (49/51 completed within 60-day timeline)
- Yap State: 100% (2/2 within 60-day timeline)

Chuuk State's reported data for this indicator was verified for accuracy. After the review, it was determined that the data provided was not documented appropriately based on the referral process of the special education procedures, and therefore could not be used for this Indicator measurement requirement. As noted in Indicator 6, Preschool LRE, and Indicator 15, General Supervision, of the 2005-2006 Annual Performance Report (APR), the Child Find provision in Chuuk State was identified as a finding of noncompliance in the September 2006 FSM-HESA Focused Monitoring visit, as well as a concern raised during the OSEP on-site monitoring/verification visit in October 2006. Specific corrective action steps have been identified to ensure correction of noncompliance, including reporting of accurate data, frequent targeted monitoring, and verification visits to provide technical assistance and supports to Chuuk State to ensure improvement in areas of concern or noncompliance.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of children with parental consent received were evaluated within 60 days.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of children with parental consent received were evaluated within 60 days.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of children with parental consent received were evaluated within 60 days.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of children with parental consent received were evaluated within 60 days.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of children with parental consent received were evaluated within 60 days.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

1. Continue implementation of the FSM-HESA *Continuous Improvement* Monitoring System, with a focus on monitoring identification percentages in the early grades, 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, with the implementation of focused monitoring visits for FSM states in noncompliance with this Indicator measurement.
 - 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 nationwide targeted improvement activities for subsequent years.
 - 1.2 Resource: Technical support from appropriate IHE or technical assistance provider.

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

2. Facilitate LEA training for staff and parents regarding the Child Find requirements for identification, referral, evaluation, and eligibility of all students with disabilities.
 - 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 sessions in subsequent years.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to page 1 of this SPP for development description.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The FSM Handbook for the Delivery of Special Education Services includes procedures for documenting the secondary transition requirements. Although FSM-HESA reports on this compliance measurement for youth with IEPs ages 16 and above, transition procedures begin for youth with IEPs 14 years of age. FSM-HESA monitors the transition for students with IEPs beginning at 14 years of age and for 8th graders transitioning to 9th grade.

Each FSM State LEA has a high school transition program that primarily facilitates work and community experiences for youth with disabilities. In previous years, FSM-HESA coordinated on-site training for educators and parents on developing and implementing appropriate transition services based on student interest and family needs within the island community context. Various resources, such as the transition guide developed by University of Oregon, have been provided to the FSM State LEA Special Education Program.

FSM-HESA facilitated 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) related to the secondary transition requirements.

To assess FSM's level of compliance with this Indicator measurement, FSM-HESA reviewed resources from the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) and the National Post-School Outcomes (PSO) Center. The NSTTAC's checklist provides guidance for the review of the IEPs to include "coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goal."

The FSM *Continuous Improvement* Monitoring System includes procedures for monitoring evidence through file reviews and interviews of the secondary transition requirements. The monitoring system has been aligned with the SPP Indicators with the Monitoring Team checklist requiring documented evidence of meeting the secondary transition requirements.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Reporting Year 2005-2006		
# of Youth with an IEP aged 16 and above	# 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 child to meet the post-secondary goals.	% 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 child to meet the post-secondary goals.
154	73	47% (73/154)

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

As reported by the FSM State LEAs, a total of 154 youth with an IEP aged 16 and above were served during school year 2005-2006. Of the 154, 47% (73/154) had an IEP that included coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the youth to meet post-secondary goals, demonstrating noncompliance with the IDEA Part B secondary transition requirements.

A breakdown of the reported percentage by FSM State LEAs reveals the following:

- Chuuk State: ---- (Inaccurate data reported)
- Kosrae State: 32 out of 32 IEPs or 100% met measurement requirements
- Pohnpei State: 41 out of 101 IEPs or 41% met measurement requirements
- Yap State: 0 out of 21 IEPs or 0% met measurement requirements

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FSM-HESA reported a baseline of 47% (73/154) representing noncompliance with this Indicator. It should be noted that Pohnpei State reported that the total number included youth with IEPs aged 16 who were in the upper elementary grades/junior high (8th grade).

The lack of consistent procedures for collecting data on measurable annual goals and transitional services for secondary students with IEPs is an issue facing Chuuk State. Chuuk State reported inaccurate data for this Indicator measurement. Chuuk’s first quarter progress report will be reviewed to determine steps taken to correct this issue. Chuuk is required to complete and submit a report to indicate performance on this indicator and shall verify the data through their quarterly progress report and the on-site monitoring scheduled for 2006-2007. It is possible that a targeted visit will be made to Chuuk to provide technical assistance to be able to respond to this indicator requirement as well as the other indicator requirements.

Yap State reported data indicated no evidence of having the required written documentation to meet this compliance indicator measure. This was raised as a noncompliance during the February 2005 FSM-HESA on-site monitoring visit. Given the lack of progress since the February 2005 visit, FSM-HESA will be conducting a monitoring visit in 2006-2007 resulting in a “determination” of consequences, including sanctions, if physical evidence does not demonstrate compliance with this IDEA Part B requirement. (refer to Indicator 15 for discussion)

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	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
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
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
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
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

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

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Through contractual services with University of Hawaii, Center on Disability Studies, Pacific Outreach Initiative (UH-CDC POI), the following improvement activities will be implemented:

1. By May 2007, Secondary Education Transition procedural handbook will be developed.
 - 1.1 Timeline: By May 2007 with yearly updates
 - 1.2 Resources: UH-CDC POI, FSM State LEA Special Education Coordinators
2. By September of each year, training will be provided on the development of Individual Transition Planning Process.
 - 2.1 Timeline: Annual Training
 - 2.2 Resources: UH-CDC POI, FSM State LEA Special Education Coordinators, Secondary Teachers
3. By June 2007, FSM HESA will develop and implement procedures for data collection and reporting.
 - 3.1 Timeline: Annual Training
 - 3.2 Resources: FSM State LEA Special Education Coordinators and Data Clerks
4. On a yearly basis, on-site technical assistance will be provided in two of the states to Special Education Coordinators, Regular Education Administrators, Secondary Transition Teachers, Parents, Consumer/Student Trainees, College representatives, Chamber of Commerce representatives, Business Organizations, and others.
 - 4.1 Timeline: Annual Training
 - 4.2 Resources: UH-CDC POI, FSM State LEA Special Education Coordinators, Secondary Teachers

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to page 1 of this SPP for development description.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

FSM-HESA will gather post-school outcome data annually between April and September for students with disabilities who received special education services and who graduated with a regular high school diploma, dropped out, withdrew or reached maximum age during the previous school year.

For the purpose of the reporting requirements, the following data categories, along with its definition, will be used:

- Graduated with a regular high school diploma, which is defined as meeting course credits established by each FSM State Department of Education. Graduates include students with disabilities that meet the same standards for graduation as students without disabilities.
- Dropped Out. Dropouts include students who were not enrolled at the end of the year and did not exit through any of the other exiting categories.
- Moved, Not Known to be Continuing (Withdrawals) – This category refers to students who have moved and transferred to another island or district and are NOT KNOWN to be continuing in another educational program. This includes students where there is no evidence (e.g. a record request) to indicate that they have enrolled in another educational program. The school must verify that the family is no longer at their known residence.
- Reached Maximum Age – Students exiting under this category are students that reached maximum age (age 22) for receipt of special education services, including students with disabilities who reached the maximum age and did not receive a diploma.
- Employed – “Competitive employment” as defined by the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. (Authority: Sections 7(11) and 12(c) the Act; 29 U.S.C. 705(11) and 709(c). Full-time status of employment is working 35 or more hours per week, while part-time status is working less than 35 hours per week.
- Unemployed – Not earning any income or not engaged in an income generating occupation.
- Off-Island – No longer residing in the FSM.
- Post Secondary Education - For reporting purposes Post Secondary Education is defined as “a formal instructional program whose curriculum is designed for students who have completed the requirements for a high school diploma or its equivalent. This includes programs whose purpose is academic, vocational, and excludes a vocational and adult basic education programs”. The FSM College of Micronesia provides an academic community college program with full-time student

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

considered to hold at least twelve (12) credits during the Fall and Spring semester, and a part-time student holding less than twelve (12) credits during the Fall and Spring semester.

Post-school outcome data will be collected annually between April and September, commencing April 2007 for those students who were “leavers” for the 2005-2006 school year, and each school year thereafter.

Data will be collected using the University of Oregon National Post-School Outcomes (PSO) data collection protocol to gather relevant demographics data for those youth with disabilities considered “leavers” during school year 2005-2006. The University of Hawaii Center for Disability Studies (UH CDS) will assist FSM in reviewing and adapting protocol to better serve the program and meet the requirements. All data from the post-school outcome survey will be gathered and entered into the FSM Student Information Tracking System (SITS) designed specifically to capture data needed for SPP/APR reporting requirements to assist each FSM state in improving services and supports youth with disabilities and individual schools, and to improve linkages between school, home, community, post-secondary schools, and employers.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

Baseline, targets, and improvement activities due in 2006-2007.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Baseline, targets and improvement activities due in 2006-2007.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	New indicator.
2006 (2006-2007)	Baseline to be established.
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 page 1 of this SPP for development description.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

During the August 2006 Parent/Consumer Conference held in Yap State, a specific session was conducted for parents and service providers in attendance on parent rights, to include the complaints and due process system.

In November 2006, FSM-HESA updated its complaints and due process system to include the provisions for hearing resolutions. Training was conducted in Pohnpei State for FSM State representatives, including potential on-site mediators.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):

This Indicator is a “new” indicator for the reporting period, which required establishing baseline data in 2005-2006. **No resolution sessions conducted, as there were no requests for hearings. Table 7 attached for this Indicator.**

Discussion of Baseline Data:

As per OSEP’s instructions, targets for this indicator to be established ONLY if baseline data report 10 or more hearing resolutions. Therefore, FSM is not able to set targets for this Indicator measurement.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	New Indicator. As per OSEP’s instructions, targets for this indicator are required only if baseline data report 10 or more hearing resolutions were held.
2006 (2006-2007)	
2007 (2007-2008)	
2008 (2008-2009)	
2009 (2009-2010)	
2010 (2010-2011)	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

The FSM Parent & Consumer Conference: *Accept and Respect Everyone's Uniqueness* was held August 2-5, 2006 in Yap State. A total of 151 participants representing all four FSM states were in attendance; of which 67 or 44% were parents of children with disabilities, 9 or 6% were individuals with disabilities (consumers), and 75 or 50% were service providers.

On the last day of the conference, parents of children with disabilities were asked to complete the Family Outcomes Survey adapted from the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) survey. Of the 67 parents in attendance, **35 or 52% completed the survey**. Of the 35 who completed the survey, 2 or 5% were from Chuuk State, 3 or 9% were from Kosrae, 3 or 9% were from Pohnpei, and 27 or 77% were from Yap.

The adapted Family Outcomes Survey was divided into topical areas with two or three questions asked for each area. Parents were asked to respond to each question by checking a "rating" that best described their perception or understanding of the question related to the topical area. The **range of possible responses** were from 1 (low) to 4 (high) as follows:

- 1 = No understanding or beginning to understand the item asked about;
- 2 = Some understanding or progress related to the item asked about;
- 3 = A lot, but not quite enough, of an understanding of the item asked about; and
- 4 = Confidence in understanding or progress made in the item asked about.

The completion of the Family Outcomes Survey was limited to those in attendance at the conference. Given the low numbers of participants in the conference from Chuuk, Kosrae, and Pohnpei, the following survey summary therefore represents the total perception from the respondents and do not necessarily represent each FSM state's parent perception. However, as a collective accounting of parent perception in the FSM, the summary data will be used as FSM's baseline data for "parent involvement" to address FSM's State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator #8 for the 2005-2006 reporting period.

The summary provides the following:

- The **total number of responses** for each question. This total per question shows how many checked a response for each question. Although a total of 35 completed surveys were collected, not all surveys included a "check" indicating a response for each question.
- The **range of responses** for each question. This shows whether a response "rating" (1, 2, 3, or 4) was checked by the respondents.
- **Percentage of respondents who checked a "3" or "4"** for each question to represent parents who reported that they had a lot, yet not enough, knowledge (3) to confidence in understanding (4) the specific question asked in each item. The percentages indicate that the parents knew quite a bit about the area, which would imply that the school or special education program facilitated the increased knowledge and understanding of the area.
- **Mean or average response** is provided for each question to show a collective accounting of the responses. The mean closer to "3" or above shows a general agreement that the parents knew a lot about the item, which again would imply that the school or special education program facilitated the increased knowledge and understanding of the topical area.

FSM Health, Education, & Social Affairs (HESA) ❖ Special Education Program
Indicator 8: Parent Involvement Survey SUMMARY, August 2006

Understanding your Child's Strengths, Abilities, and Special Needs

Item #	Question	Total # Responses for Question	Range of Responses	% "3" & "4" Responses	Average Response
A.	Your child is growing and learning. How well do you understand your child's development?	35	1 – 4	51% (18/35)	2.8
B.	Some children have special health needs, disability, or are delayed in their development. How much do you know about your child's special needs?	35	2 – 4	60% (21/35)	2.7
C.	Professionals who work with you and your child want to know if the things they do are working. Are you able to tell if your child is making progress?	35	1 – 4	23% (8/35)	2.0

Knowing your Rights and Advocating for your Child

Item #	Question	Total # Responses for Question	Range of Responses	% "3" & "4" Responses	Average Response
D.	A variety of programs and services may be available for your child and family. Do you know what is available for your child and family?	34	1 – 4	24% (8/34)	1.99
E.	Parents often meet with professionals to plan services or activities. How comfortable are you participating in these meetings?	35	1 – 4	71% (25/35)	2.8
F.	Families of children with special needs have rights, and there are things you can do if you are not satisfied. How well do you know your rights?	33	1 – 4	36% (12/33)	2.4

Helping your Child Develop and Learn

Item #	Question	Total # Responses for Question	Range of Responses	% "3" & "4" Responses	Average Response
G.	All parents help their children develop and learn, but sometimes it is hard to know what to do. How would you describe your ability to help your child develop to learn?	34	1 – 4	9% (3/34)	1.7
H.	All parents try to help their children learn to behave the way they would like, but sometimes it is hard to know what to do. How would you describe your ability to help your child learn to behave the way you would like?	35	1 – 4	23% (8/35)	1.7
I.	Professionals have worked with you to develop a plan to help your child learn new skills and behaviors. How much are you able to help your child learn or practice new skills at home or in your community?	33	1 – 4	60% (21/35)	2.6

FSM Health, Education, & Social Affairs (HESA) ❖ Special Education Program
Indicator 8: Parent Involvement Survey SUMMARY, August 2006

Having Support Systems

Item #	Question	Total # Responses for Question	Range of Responses	% "3" & "4" Response	Average Response
J.	Many people feel that talking with another person helps them deal with problems or celebrate when good things happen. Does your family have someone you trust to listen and talk with you?	33	1 – 4	67% (22/33)	2.8
K.	Families sometimes must rely on other people for help when they need it, for example to provide a person to run an errand, or watch their child for a short period of time. Do you have someone you can call on when you need help with things?	34	1 – 4	76% (26/34)	2.9
L.	Most families have things they enjoy doing. How much is your family able to do the things you enjoy?	34	1 – 4	59% (20/34)	2.6

Accessing your Community

Item #	Question	Total # Responses for Question	Range of Responses	% "3" & "4" Response	Average Response
M.	All children need medical care. Do you have the medical care you want for your child right now?	30	1 – 4	13% (4/30)	1.9
N.	Many families want their child to play with other children or participate in religious, or social activities. If you want your child to participate in such activities, do you have what you want right now?	30	1 – 4	27% (8/30)	2.3

Your Feeling about your Child's Preschool Program

Item #	Question	Total # Responses for Question	Range of Responses	% "3" & "4" Response	Average Response
O.	To what extent has your child's preschool program helped you know how to help your child learn?	30	1 – 4	27% (8/30)	2.1
P.	To what extent has your child's school encouraged you to be actively involved in your child's education at school?	31	1 – 4	39% (12/31)	2.4
Q.	To what extent has your child's school included you as a full partner in making decisions about your child's education?	29	1 – 4	48% (14/29)	2.4

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

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

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

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