

Federated States of Micronesia Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE		
<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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>FSM's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 83%. FSM met its FFY 2005 target of 74%.</p>	<p>FSM revised the improvement activities in the APR and OSEP accepts those revisions. The revised improvement activities must be added to the SPP.</p> <p>OSEP's March 20, 2006 SPP response letter required FSM to reconsider its baseline data for this indicator in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, and provide accurate, updated data and improvement activities. In the FFY 2005 APR, FSM explained that in the data reported for FFY 2004, the number of graduating seniors with IEPs was accurate. FSM met its target and OSEP appreciates FSM'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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>FSM's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 1%. FSM met its FFY 2005 target of 3%.</p>	<p>FSM revised the improvement activities in the APR and OSEP accepts those revisions. The revised improvement activities must be added to the SPP.</p> <p>OSEP's March 20, 2006 SPP response letter required FSM to reconsider its baseline data for this indicator in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, and provide accurate, updated data and improvement activities. FSM confirmed the accuracy of its baseline data.</p> <p>FSM met its target and OSEP appreciates FSM's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Indicator 3A is not applicable to FSM because FSM is not a recipient of funds from the No Child Left Behind Act.</p>	<p>FSM is not required to submit data for Indicator 3A.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children</p>	<p>FSM's FFY 2005 reported</p>	<p>FSM revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its APR and</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>data for this indicator are 41% for reading and 39% for math. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 43% for reading; the data for math stayed the same. FSM did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 60%.</p> <p>Prior noncompliance not corrected.</p>	<p>OSEP accepts those revisions. FSM must add these revisions to the SPP. OSEP looks forward to reviewing FSM's data demonstrating improved performance in the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP's March 20, 2006 SPP response letter required FSM to include in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, baseline data for the participation of children with disabilities in alternate assessments, and data demonstrating the correction of prior noncompliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.138 and 300.139 (now 34 CFR §300.160). In its FFY 2005 APR, FSM stated that it was not able to implement its alternate assessments for the 2005-2006 school year and therefore did not provide data on alternate assessments and did not timely correct identified noncompliance with these requirements. FSM provided revised improvement activities for implementing alternate assessments. Furthermore, in its FFY 2005 APR, FSM reported that no children with disabilities took the NST with accommodations and acknowledged that this raised concerns regarding the effectiveness of the IEP participation determination by the IEP team or the communication between each FSM State LEA Special Education office and the Assessment Team administering the NST.</p> <p>In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, FSM must provide data and information demonstrating that FSM has: (1) developed and distributed accommodation guidelines, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(b); and (2) developed and implemented alternate assessments and guidelines for the participation of children with disabilities in alternate assessments for those children who cannot participate in regular assessments, even with accommodations, as indicated in their respective IEPs, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(c)(1).</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>FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 7% for reading and 3% for math.</p>	<p>FSM revised the improvement activities and targets for this indicator in its APR and OSEP accepts those revisions. The improvement activities and targets must be added to the SPP.</p> <p>OSEP's March 20, 2006 SPP response letter required FSM to include in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, baseline data regarding the performance of children with disabilities on the NST and alternate assessments, because FSM did not provide baseline data for this indicator in the FFY 2004 SPP. FSM provided data for performance of children with</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>disabilities on the NST. FSM stated that no alternate assessments were administered to children with disabilities, and the data indicated that no children with disabilities took the NST with accommodations. FSM must provide data on performance for children taking the NST with alternate assessments and accommodations in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing FSM's proficiency data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</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>FSM's FFY 2005 reported data are 0%.</p>	<p>FSM reported that no children with disabilities were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days in a school year. OSEP appreciates FSM's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>OSEP's March 20, 2006 SPP response letter referenced FSM's difficulties with implementing its data system. FSM reported in its FFY 2005 APR that the collection of suspension and expulsion data is not consistently maintained in the schools. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, FSM must provide information on the status of data collection for suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities.</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>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>This indicator is not applicable to FSM as the only racial/ethnic group present is Asian/Pacific Islander.</p>
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6</p>	<p>A. FSM's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the FSM's data demonstrating improvement in</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>93%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 97%. FSM did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 97%.</p> <p>B. FSM's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 0%. FSM met its FFY 2005 target of 0%.</p> <p>C. FSM's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 7%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 3%. FSM did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 3%.</p>	<p>performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>FSM reported in its FFY 2005 APR that it is planning on reassessing its targets for this indicator based on data provided by Chuuk. OSEP recommends that FSM reexamine its target for Indicator 5B. A target of 0% is not appropriate for this indicator as it is not consistent with the requirement for FSM to have a continuum of alternative placements available to meet the needs of children with disabilities, as provided by 34 CFR §300.115.</p>
<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>FSM's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 34%. FSM met its FFY 2005 target of 30%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 20, 2006 SPP response letter required FSM to include in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, data on the number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 in Chuuk, and the number of such children in settings with typically developing peers. FSM was also required to provide an explanation of the setting for each child with an IEP aged 3 through 5 in Chuuk, analyze that data and information, and make a determination regarding compliance with the requirements at 34 CFR §§300.550-300.552 (now 34 CFR §§300.114-300.116).</p> <p>In its FFY 2005 APR, FSM provided data from Chuuk in response to OSEP's March 20, 2006 letter indicating that 34 out of 239 (14%) preschool children with IEPs received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers. FSM reported that for FFY 2005, Chuuk automatically assigned the segregated setting as the placement for all preschool children and identified noncompliance in Chuuk with the requirements at 34 CFR §§300.114-300.116. In the FFY 2005 APR, FSM included a plan to correct this noncompliance, with strategies, proposed evidence of change, and targets, but did not provide timelines for correction</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>of noncompliance.</p> <p>In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, in addition to the information required to be reported for Indicator 6, FSM must document that it has updated its plan to include timelines for correction of this noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from September 2006, when FSM identified the noncompliance in Chuuk, and provide updated data and information for 2006–2007 regarding the number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 in Chuuk, and the number of such children who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.</p> <p>FSM met its target, and OSEP appreciates FSM’s efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>Please note that, due to changes in the 618 State-reported data collection, this indicator will change for the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. States will be required to describe how they will collect valid and reliable data to provide baseline and targets in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</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 early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>Entry data provided.</p>	<p>FSM reported the required entry data and activities. FSM must provide progress data and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a</p>	<p>FSM’s FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 39%.</p>	<p>FSM provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. FSM’s data for Indicator 8 is based on a pilot of a survey of parents. FSM acknowledged that this pilot is not</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>		<p>representative of parents in FSM and plans on surveying all parents starting in May 2007.</p>
Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality		
<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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>This indicator is not applicable to FSM as the only racial/ethnic group present is Asian/Pacific Islander.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>This indicator is not applicable to FSM as the only racial/ethnic group present is Asian/Pacific Islander.</p>
Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision		
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline).</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>FSM's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 95%. FSM did not meet the FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>FSM provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP notes that the data provided by FSM for this indicator does not include data from Chuuk. In the FFY 2006 APR, FSM must include data from Chuuk in its response to Indicator 11.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).</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.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>FSM is not an eligible applicant under the Part C program.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]		
<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; New]</p>	<p>FSM's FFY 2005 baseline data for this indicator are 47%. FSM did not meet the FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>FSM provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The data for this indicator did not include data from Chuuk. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, FSM must include data from Chuuk in this indicator. FSM reported in Indicator 15 of its FFY 2005 APR that prior noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.320(b) regarding transition goals and services in the IEP, was partially corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>FSM must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable FSM to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.320(b), including correction of noncompliance identified prior to and including FFY 2005.</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 post-secondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>A plan that describes how data will be collected for submission with the APR due February 1, 2008 was provided.</p>	<p>FSM reported the required entry data and activities. FSM must provide baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</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 one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>FSM's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 60%. FSM did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 20, 2006 SPP response letter required FSM to include in its FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007: (1) baseline data for FFY 2004 and progress data for FFY 2005; and (2) FSM's determination about whether the improvement activities in the FFY 2004 SPP should be modified so that FSM could meet its targets for this indicator.</p> <p>In response to OSEP's March 20, 2006 letter, FSM provided data from 2004-2005 and 2005-2006. However, the baseline data for FFY 2004 should have included the number of findings of noncompliance made by FSM in 2003-2004 that were corrected in 2004-2005; progress data for FFY 2005 should have been the number of findings of noncompliance made by FSM in 2004-2005 and corrected in 2005-2006. OSEP understands that its response letter may not have provided sufficient direction to FSM and will</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>accept its FFY 2005 reported data (noncompliance identified in 2004–2005 and corrected in a timely manner) as its baseline data for this indicator.</p> <p>Although FSM reported a 50% level of correction, OSEP recalculated the data provided by FSM and determined that FSM made 5 findings of noncompliance within 2004–2005 and corrected 3 of those findings in a timely manner, for a rate of 60% correction. The 5 findings are numbers 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 reported by FSM in Indicator 15. FSM determined not to revise the improvement activities in the FFY 2005 APR, but to revise its Continuous Improvement Monitoring System to address OSEP’s concerns regarding activities needed to meet its targets for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600. In its response to Indicator 15 in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, FSM must disaggregate by APR indicator the status of timely correction of the noncompliance findings identified by FSM during 2004–2005 (FFY 2005) and during 2005–2006 (FFY 2006). In addition, FSM must, in responding to Indicators 3(B), 6, 11, and 13 specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issues that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>(Compliance Indicator)</p>	<p>FSM had no written complaints in FFY 2005.</p>	<p>FSM had no written complaints in FFY 2005.</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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>FSM had no due process hearings in FFY 2005.</p>	<p>FSM had no due process hearings in FFY 2005.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	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; New]</p>	<p>FSM reported no resolutions sessions held.</p>	<p>FSM is not required to provide baseline targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more resolution sessions were held.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>FSM reported no mediations.</p>	<p>FSM is not required to provide targets or improvement activities for this indicator until any FFY in which 10 or more mediations were conducted.</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>FSM's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 75%. FSM did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 20, 2006 SPP response letter required FSM to reconsider the baseline data for Indicators 1 and 2 of the SPP in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, and to ensure that any activities or strategies regarding Indicator 20 result in the collection of the required baseline data for the required time period and the baseline data and any other required data reported in the FFY APR due February 1, 2007. FSM reported that its baseline data for Indicators 1 and 2 were accurate.</p> <p>Westat's December 26, 2006 email to FSM indicated personnel, exiting, and discipline data required under section 618 of IDEA were not submitted timely.</p> <p>FSM's data indicates noncompliance with the requirements in IDEA section 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). FSM must review its improvement strategies and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure that they will enable FSM to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in IDEA section 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>