

Guam Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 74.47%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 62%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 55%.</p> <p>The State calculated its baseline and targets based on a cohort graduation rate. Therefore, OSEP is using the cohort graduation rate of 74.47% to determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p> <p>In FFY 2006, the State also calculated a graduation rate of 68.3% based on a single event rate. If the State believes that the single event graduation rate is more accurate, the State may revise its baseline and targets based on the single event graduation rate.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 2.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 8%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of .7%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Not applicable to Guam.</p>	
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 75% for reading and 76% for math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 83% for reading and slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 85% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 83% for reading and did not</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

Guam Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>meet its FFY 2006 target of 83% for math.</p>	
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 3.16% for math and 3.08% for reading. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 2.9% for math and slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 3.13% for reading.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 30% for reading and did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 30% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 3.38% of children with disabilities were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days compared to .32% of children without disabilities. Guam defines "significant discrepancy" as when the percentage calculated for children with disabilities exceeds the percentage calculated for children without disabilities. Therefore, Guam identified a significant discrepancy in FFY 2006. The gap between children with disabilities and children without disabilities was 3.06%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of a 2.34% gap.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State did not provide the information required by the FFY 2005 response table related to describing how the State reviewed, and if appropriate, revised its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a description of the review, and if appropriate revision, of its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>While the State indicated that it would carry on discussions with the Guam Education Policy Board to review and revise policy regarding suspension and expulsion of students with disabilities, the State did not describe its review, and if appropriate, revision, of policies, procedures and practices relating to the</p>

Guam Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA. This constitutes noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State’s examination of data from FFY 2007 (2006-2007). In addition, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate, revision, of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the State in FFY 2006, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>	

Guam Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
[Results Indicator]																		
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 349 1419 729"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>36%</td> <td>38%</td> <td>42%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>29%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>0%</td> <td>.3%</td> <td>.04%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress in 5A and slippage in 5B and 5C from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	36%	38%	42%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	29%	30%	25%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	0%	.3%	.04%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target															
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	36%	38%	42%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	29%	30%	25%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	0%	.3%	.04%															
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																	
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 1295 1419 1520"> <thead> <tr> <th>06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th>Social Emotional</th> <th>Knowledge & Skills</th> <th>Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a. % of preschoolers who did not</td> <td>10%</td> <td>10%</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not	10%	10%	3%	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009; and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>								
06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior															
a. % of preschoolers who did not	10%	10%	3%															

Guam Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]</p>	improve functioning.				
	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	19%	25%	19%	
	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	13%	25%	13%	
	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	35%	29%	29%	
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	23%	10%	35%	
	The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.				
<p>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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 70%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 62%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 62%.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>Guam is not required to report on this Indicator.</p>				
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result</p>	<p>Guam is not required to report on this indicator.</p>				

Guam Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>		
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 51%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 44%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State conducted a review to determine whether evaluations were completed and eligibility meetings were held for all children whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were not completed within the required timeline in FFY 2005. The State accounted for all children whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were not completed in a timely manner in FFY 2005. The State reported that a corrective action plan (CAP) was developed and implemented on October 5, 2007. The State also reported that the CAP, combined with weekly monitoring and feedback to Program Coordinators, has resulted in a significant increase relative to the number and proportion of student evaluations that have been completed within 60 days.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its APR and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 92%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 90%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported on when IEPs were developed and implemented for the four children whose IEPs were developed beyond their third birthday in FFY 2005.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b),</p>

Guam Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.
<p>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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 3%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2005 data of 7%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator was not corrected and reported that the transition program is diligently collaborating with IEP teams at the schools to address this issue of noncompliance. The State reported that it has aggressively implemented corrective action steps and consulting resource teachers and other special education specialists have been identified to assist transition teachers in developing transition plans for every youth aged 16 and above. The State reported that the number of students who currently have transition goals included in their IEP has increased from 3% to 43% as of December 30, 2007.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 57%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 50%. However, OSEP recalculated the data to be 62.5% based on the timely correction of five of eight findings identified in FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008: (1) data on correction of outstanding noncompliance</p>

Guam Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>one year from identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that five of ten findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. However, two of the findings of noncompliance (procedural safeguards and receiving IEP services) were identified prior to FFY 2005. The State reported that these two findings of noncompliance remain uncorrected. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it will continue to develop procedures for utilizing interpreters and translators and develop written translations of the procedural safeguards in the native language of Guam; increase recruitment efforts; and, implement strategies to ensure that all eligible students with disabilities receive special education and related services on their IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that five of eight findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it will use focused monitoring and increase the number of State monitoring personnel; provide training for professional personnel and parents and youth with disabilities; implement strategies that all eligible students with disabilities receive special education and related services on their IEPs; and, develop an integrated data system.</p>	<p>identified through other general supervision mechanisms in the FFY 2004 SPP; (2) data that demonstrate compliance with the requirement at 34 CFR §300.504(d) to provide the notice of procedural safeguards in the native language of the parent and take steps to ensure that the parent understands the content of the notice and that there is written evidence that the requirements at 34 CFR §300.504(d) are met; and (3) data that demonstrate compliance with the requirements at 34 CFR §300.101 regarding children with disabilities receiving all of the special education and related services on their IEPs. The State did not provide the required information.</p> <p>The State must provide, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009: (1) data that demonstrate compliance with the requirement at 34 CFR §300.504(d) to provide the notice of procedural safeguards in the native language of the parent and take steps to ensure that the parent understands the content of the notice and that there is written evidence that the requirements at 34 CFR §300.504(d) are met; and (2) data that demonstrate compliance with the requirements at 34 CFR §300.101 regarding children with disabilities receiving all of the special education and related services on their IEPs. The State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the State's general supervision systems. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure</p>

Guam Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>that it can report, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that it has corrected this noncompliance.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State is in compliance with the requirements of 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600. In addition, in responding to Indicators 4A, 11, 12 and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on five complaints. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that it did not have any fully adjudicated hearings during the reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

Guam Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that one of two resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements. The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2006. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 50%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that two of two mediations held resulted in mediation agreements. The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2006. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more mediations were held.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 93%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 86.3%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>