Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
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]	RMI revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI reported that it had no graduation data for the 2006-2007 school year because no students with IEPs entered high school by "passing" the Marshall Islands High School Entrance Test in 2003.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing RMI's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
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]	RMI revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 11%. RMI met its target of 40%.	OSEP appreciates RMI's efforts to improve performance.
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]	Indicator 3A is not applicable to RMI.	Indicator 3A is not applicable because the assessment requirements in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act do not apply to RMI.
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 assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement	RMI's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator on the eighth grade MISAT high school entrance exam are 80.76% for reading 80.76% for math. Only eighth grade students took the Marshall Islands Standards Achievement Test (MISAT) because the MISAT was used as a high school entrance test in 2006-2007; 21 of 26 students with IEPs took the Grade 8 MISAT. RMI did not administer the MISAT in Grades 3 and 6 as a statewide assessment in 2006-2007. OSEP was unable to determine progress or slippage or whether RMI met its targets because RMI submitted data for only one grade for FFY 2006	OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required RMI to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, documentation that RMI is conducting alternate assessments for the eighth grade MISAT. RMI provided information about the development of its eighth grade alternate assessments by the GSEG Pacific Assessment Consortium (PAC6), and attached a copy of the criteria for alternate assessment to the FFY 2006 SPP/APR.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
standards. [Results Indicator]	and the FFY 2005 data were from several grades.	However, on page 11 of the FFY 2006 APR, RMI reported that none of the eighth grade students with disabilities who took the MISAT in the 2006-2007 school year needed an alternate assessment. RMI must provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009 on any eighth grade students who take the MISAT using alternate assessments. OSEP looks forward to reviewing RMI's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards. [Results Indicator]	RMI's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator on the eighth grade MISAT high school entrance test are 0% for math and 12% for reading. RMI extrapolated those data, as the MISAT was used as a high school entrance test in 2006-2007 and the high school entrance test has no "pass" or "fail" criteria. OSEP was unable to determine progress or slippage or whether RMI met its targets because RMI submitted data for only one grade for FFY 2006 and the FFY 2005 data were from several grades.	OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/ARR response table and OSEP's February 9, 2007 verification letter required RMI to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, information about its progress in implementing the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) plan. On pages 11 and 12 of the FFY 2006 APR, RMI discussed its plan for increasing the level of education for teachers and providing teacher training as a strategy to improve student proficiency scores. OSEP looks forward to reviewing RMI's progress in implementing its CSPD plan in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009. OSEP looks forward to reviewing RMI's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:	RMI revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.	OSEP appreciates RMI's efforts to improve performance.
A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of	RMI's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0%. RMI met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.	In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, RMI must describe the results of RMI's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008).

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues			OSEP Analysis/Next Steps	
children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and					
[Results Indicator]					
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:	Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required	l for the FI	FY 2006 A	APR.	
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.					
[Results Indicator]					
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or	RMI revised improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI revised the targets for 5A for this indicator in its SPP based upon the revised baseline data submitted in the FFY 2005 APR and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI should review, and if necessary, revise its targets for 5B and 5C. RMI's reported data for this indicator are:		OSEP appreciates RMI's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to RMI's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.		
C. Served in public or private		FFY	FFY	FFY	
separate schools, residential		2005	2006	2006	
placements, or homebound or hospital placements.		Data	Data	Target	
[Results Indicator]	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	72.8%	92.6%	80%	
	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	26.2%	5.2%	2%	
	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1%	2%	0%	
	However, RMI's FFY 2006 data under IDE are 76% for 5A. The 618 data for 5A and RMI's reported data				

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues			OSEP Analysis/Next Steps	
	from the FFY 2005 data; RMI's reported data represent slippage for 5C from the FFY 2005 data.				
	RMI did not meet its FFY 2006 targets.				
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). [Results Indicator]	Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for	or the FFY	7 2006 AP	R.	
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	RMI revised improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:			OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required RMI to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a definition of "comparable to same-aged"	
	06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	peers." RMI provided that definition on page 21 of the FFY 2006 APR. No further action is required. RMI reported the required progress data and
early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	0%	0%	0%	improvement activities. RMI must provide progress data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, and baseline data and
[Results Indicator; New]	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	16.6%	16.6%	16.6%	targets, with the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010.
	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	41.8%	41.8%	41.8%	
	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	25%	25%	25%	
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to	16.6%	16.6%	16.6%	

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	RMI provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.	
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]	RMI revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 92%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 92%. RMI did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 93%.	OSEP looks forward to RMI's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
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]	Indicator 9 is not applicable to RMI.	This indicator is not applicable to RMI because the only racial/ethnic group present is Asian/Pacific Islander.
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]	Indicator 10 is not applicable to RMI.	This indicator is not applicable to RMI because the only racial/ethnic group present is Asian/Pacific Islander.
11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]	RMI revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. RMI met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates RMI's efforts in achieving compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).
12. Percent of children referred	Indicator 12 is not applicable to RMI.	RMI is not an eligible applicant under the

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
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]		Part C program.
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. [Compliance Indicator]	RMI revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPI OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 77%. RMI met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition
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. [Results Indicator; New]	RMI provided baseline data, targets, and improvement activities for indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. RMI's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are: Percent of youth who are competitively employed. Percent of youth who are in some type of postsecondary school. Percent of youth who are both competitively employed and in some type of postsecondary school. .	OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required RMI to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, definitions for "competitive employment" and "post-secondary education." RMI provided those definitions on page 34 of the FFY 2006 APR. No further action is required. OSEP looks forward to reviewing RMI's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. [Compliance Indicator]	RMI revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPI OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. RMI met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	response table required RMI to include in the

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		requirements and findings of noncompliance with Part B requirements; and (2) includes correction of identified noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case later then one year from the date of identification of noncompliance through monitoring. RMI submitted updated monitoring procedures with the FFY 2006 SPP/APR. On page 36 of the FFY 2006 APR, RMI clarifies that findings identified as areas for improvement in monitoring reports are considered noncompliance for the purpose of administering the Part B program. On pages 36-39 of the FFY 2006 APR, RMI provided information that demonstrates it identifies its findings of noncompliance consistent with Part B. In Section C of RMI's updated monitoring procedures, RMI states that findings of noncompliance are corrected as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the date of identification. OSEP appreciates RMI's efforts in timely correcting noncompliance identified under this indicator in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.
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]	RMI revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI reported that it did not receive any signed written complaints during the reporting period.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing RMI's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were	RMI revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing RMI's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1,

Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
RMI reported that it did not receive any due process hearing requests during the reporting period.	2009
RMI revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI reported that no resolution sessions were held during the reporting period.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing RMI's data in the FFY 2007 APR due February 1, 2009.
RMI revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI reported that no mediations were held during the reporting period.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing RMI's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
RMI revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 98%. RMI did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required RMI to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, information about RMI's progress in implementing its system for collecting and reporting timely and accurate data. On page 47 of the FFY 2006 APR, RMI reported that the design of its on-line, web-based computerized data collection and information retrieval system is completed, but RMI still needs assistance to operationalize the on-line system. OSEP appreciates this information and looks forward to reviewing information about RMI's progress in implementing its on-line computerized data system for collecting and retrieving timely and accurate data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009. OSEP appreciates RMI's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR,
	RMI revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI reported that no resolution sessions were held during the reporting period. RMI revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI reported that no mediations were held during the reporting period. RMI revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 98%.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		due February 1, 2009, RMI's data demonstrating that it 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).