

**Table A–Federated States of Micronesia Part B  
Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan**

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p><b>Indicator 1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p><b>Noncompliance:</b> See Indicator 20 below.</p>	<p>See Indicator 20 below.</p>
<p><b>Indicator 2:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p><b>Noncompliance:</b> See Indicator 20 below.</p>	<p>See Indicator 20 below.</p>
<p><b>Indicator 3:</b> Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</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>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p><b>Noncompliance:</b> See Table B</p> <p><b>Other:</b> FSM did not provide baseline data for the proficiency rate for children with disabilities. On page 15 of the SPP, FSM stated that proficiency data will be available in 2005-2006.</p>	<p>See Table B.</p> <p>FSM must review, and if necessary revise, its improvement strategies to ensure they will enable FSM to include data in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, that will demonstrate compliance with this requirement. Failure to include these data at that time may affect OSEP’s determination of FSM’s status under section 616(d) of IDEA.</p>

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p><b>Indicator 6:</b> Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>On page 24 of the SPP, data indicated that Chuuk does not serve any children with IEPs, aged 3-5, in settings with typically developing peers; rather, Chuuk serves all such children in separate special education preschool settings. This data strongly suggest noncompliance with 34 CFR §§300.550-300.552.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, FSM must provide data on the number of children with IEPs, aged 3-5, in Chuuk, and the number of such children in settings with typically developing peers. FSM must also provide an explanation of the setting for each child with an IEP, aged 3-5, in Chuuk, who is not in a setting with typically developing peers. If the data and information indicate noncompliance with 34 CFR §§300.550-300.552, FSM must submit, in the FFY 2005 APR, a plan with strategies, proposed evidence of change, targets and timelines designed to ensure compliance within one year of its identification.</p>
<p><b>Indicator 15:</b> General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>FSM did not provide numerical baseline data for Indicators 15A and 15B. Instead, FSM indicated by "Yes" or "No" if noncompliance with certain requirements was identified in each state of the FSM.  The improvement activities on page 47 of the SPP did not address the timely correction of noncompliance (i.e., within one year of identification).</p>	<p>FSM must include, in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, both baseline data from FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) and progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through July 30, 2006). Failure to include these data may affect OSEP's determination of FSM's status under section 616(d) of IDEA.</p> <p>While FSM included some activities, with timelines and resources, it was unclear to OSEP that FSM would be able to either measure whether or when the activities were completed, the impact of those activities on compliance, or to determine whether the activities would be sufficient to enable FSM to meet its targets. FSM should review its activities to determine if additional activities are needed, or if the activities need to be revised or modified to have the desired effect.</p>
<p><b>Indicator 20:</b> State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p><b>Noncompliance:</b> On page 52 of the SPP, FSM stated that it is not in 100% compliance with the requirement to submit timely and accurate data.  On page 5 of Indicator 1, FSM stated that because this was the first year reporting these data, there were inconsistencies in the data from</p>	<p>FSM should reconsider the baseline data for Indicators 1 and 2 of the SPP and provide accurate, updated data and improvement activities in the FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007. Failure to accurately report information for these indicators may affect OSEP's determination of FSM's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
	<p>Yap, Kosrae, Chuuk and Pohnpei.</p> <p>On pages 5 and 8 of Indicators 1 and 2 of the SPP, FSM stated that public high schools do not consistently report graduation and drop-out data. Therefore, FSM was unable to provide comparison data.</p> <p>To address data inconsistencies and provide missing data, FSM indicated that it would implement the Education Management Information System (EMIS) to strengthen its ability to collect and report this data.</p>	