

Guam Part B FFY 2007 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 revised the baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 65%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 74.47%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 75%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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 improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 1.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 2.9%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of .6%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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.</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 assessment with accommodations;</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 88% for reading and 91% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 75% for reading and progress from the FFY 2006 data of 76% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Guam Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets of 86%.</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 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 1.53% for reading and 1.33% for math.</p> <p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 3.08% for reading and slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 3.16% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets of 40%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 1.25% of children with disabilities were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days compared to .85% of children without disabilities. Guam identified a significant discrepancy in FFY 2007. The gap between children with disabilities and children without disabilities was .40%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of a 3.06% gap.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, a description of 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). The State provided the required information.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> <p>As noted in the revised Part B Indicator Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must again describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008).</p> <p>In addition, because GPSS identified a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities in FFY 2007, GPSS must again describe its review, and if appropriate, revision of its policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of the IEPs, the use of positive behavioral</p>

Guam Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).																				
<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]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>																				
<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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 915 1467 1393"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td align="center">38</td> <td align="center">41</td> <td align="center">55</td> <td align="center">3.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td align="center">30</td> <td align="center">33</td> <td align="center">20</td> <td align="center">-3.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td align="center">.3</td> <td align="center">0</td> <td align="center">.04</td> <td align="center">+0.30%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5C and slippage for 5B from the</p>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	38	41	55	3.00%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	30	33	20	-3.00%	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	.3	0	.04	+0.30%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress																		
A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	38	41	55	3.00%																		
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	30	33	20	-3.00%																		
C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	.3	0	.04	+0.30%																		

Guam Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
	FFY 2006 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets for 5A and 5B and met its target for 5C.																									
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]	States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.																								
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. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="548 846 1419 1463"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 846 1062 1019">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 846 1178 1019">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1178 846 1293 1019">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1293 846 1419 1019">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1019 1062 1089">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1019 1178 1089">6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1178 1019 1293 1089">2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1293 1019 1419 1089">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1089 1062 1224">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1089 1178 1224">16</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1178 1089 1293 1224">25</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1293 1089 1419 1224">20</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1224 1062 1326">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1224 1178 1326">27</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1178 1224 1293 1326">34</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1293 1224 1419 1326">27</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1326 1062 1429">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1326 1178 1429">33</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1178 1326 1293 1429">27</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1293 1326 1419 1429">18</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1429 1062 1463">e. % of preschoolers who maintained</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1429 1178 1463">18</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1178 1429 1293 1463">12</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1293 1429 1419 1463">31</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	6	2	4	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	16	25	20	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	27	34	27	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	33	27	18	e. % of preschoolers who maintained	18	12	31	The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																							
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	6	2	4																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	16	25	20																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	27	34	27																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	33	27	18																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained	18	12	31																							

Guam Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.				
	Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	
<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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 60%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 70%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 72%.</p>				<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>Not applicable.</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]</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>				
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline).</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 81%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 51%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that evaluations were completed for the 41 students whose evaluations had not been completed in FFY 2006 (2006-2007). The State reported that based on the data for FFY 2007 of 81%, there was a significant increase in compliance from the FFY 2006 data of 51%; however, Guam did</p>				<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely initial evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was partially corrected.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of</p>

Guam Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>not meet 100% compliance for this indicator. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it is implementing a corrective action plan to help program coordinators and service providers track evaluations for the 60-day timeline and providing “aggressive monitoring and feedback.”</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, data demonstrating that the uncorrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator was corrected. The State accounted in the FFY 2006 APR for all children whose evaluations were not completed in a timely manner in FFY 2005. The State reported that it remains out of compliance with Indicator 11.</p>	<p>noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that GPSS is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that GPSS: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has completed the initial evaluation, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 98%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 92%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that IEPs were in effect for the two students referred from Part C to Part B, who were found eligible for Part B, and whose IEPs had not been developed and implemented by their third birthday in FFY 2006 (2006-2007). The State reported that an IEP was in effect for the one student referred from Part C to Part B, who was found eligible for Part B, and whose IEP had not been developed and implemented by his/her third birthday in July</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported</p>

Guam Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>2007. The State reported 100% compliance with this requirement based on data from August 2007 through June 2008, demonstrating verified correction with this finding of noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, data demonstrating that the uncorrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator was corrected. The State accounted in the FFY 2006 APR for all children whose IEPs were not in effect by their third birthday in FFY 2005. The State reported 100% compliance with this requirement based on data from August 2007 through June 2008, demonstrating verified correction with this finding of noncompliance.</p>	<p>under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that GPSS: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure compliance.</p>
<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 postsecondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 24%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 3%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that of the 704 students whose IEPs did not include the required transition content in FFY 2006 (2006-2007); 264 students' IEPs were corrected within one year and 403 students exited the school system from 2006 to 2008. For the remaining 37 students who were prioritized for correction in FFY 2006, the State reported that 16 were corrected by March 31, 2009 and 21 exited from special education and related services. The State reported that the noncompliance remains uncorrected, although the level of compliance has improved from 3% in FFY 2006 to 24% in FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that as of March 30, 2009, the level of compliance improved from 24% in FFY 2007 to 46% in FFY 2008. The State reported that of the 564 students whose IEPs did not include the required transition content in FFY 2007, 184 students' IEPs were corrected within one year, 182 students' IEPs were subsequently corrected, 20 students exited the school</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was not corrected, and reported continuing noncompliance in FFY 2006 and FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises questions about the effectiveness of the State's general supervision systems. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that it has corrected this noncompliance.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must report on the correction of the noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the</p>

Guam Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>system and the remaining 178 students' IEPs were not corrected. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported receiving on-site technical assistance from various sources to make the systemic changes necessary to correct the noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that this indicator is considered a previously identified finding of noncompliance that was not corrected in FFY 2006 and, therefore, it was not identified as a new finding in FFY 2006 because "it was an uncorrected noncompliance for that fiscal year as reported in the FFY 2006 APR." The State reported that "verification of correction continues at an individual IEP level to ensure 100% compliance with the secondary transition requirements through a review of the data system."</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, data demonstrating that the uncorrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected. Specifically, the State reported that of the 635 students whose IEPs did not include the required transition content in FFY 2005, 60 students' IEPs were corrected within one year, seven students IEPs were subsequently corrected and 568 students exited the school system from 2005 to 2008. The State reported that it remains out of compliance with Indicator 13.</p>	<p>FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that GPSS: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for each youth, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</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's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 67%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 57%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 65%.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 88%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 62.5%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that seven of eight findings of noncompliance identified in</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the State has corrected the remaining finding of noncompliance (timely initial evaluations) identified in FFY 2006 and the remaining finding of noncompliance (secondary transition) identified in FFY</p>

Guam Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it is receiving technical support from the University of Guam CEDDERS and has requested consultation and on-site visits from DAC to focus on the redesign and implementation of Guam’s general supervision system. The State reported that it would conduct an analysis of the process for verifying correction.</p> <p>The State reported that it is continuing to correct the one longstanding finding of noncompliance (secondary transition) that was identified prior to FFY 2006. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State will continue with “diligent efforts to monitor the individual IEP corrections to meet the verification of correction requirement.” In addition, the State will continue to address systemic issues to determine root causes for the noncompliance; provide procedural guidance and school-level training; and receive technical assistance from various technical assistance providers and consultants in order to meet this requirement.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009: (1) data demonstrating compliance with the requirement to provide the notice of procedural safeguards in the native language of the parent and to take steps to ensure that the parent understands the content of the notice and that there is written evidence that the requirements are met; (2) data demonstrating compliance with the requirements regarding children with disabilities receiving all of the special education and related services in their IEPs; and (3) data demonstrating that the State has corrected the remaining noncompliance identified under Indicator 15 from FFY 2005. The State reported that it developed Standard Operating Procedures for the use of interpreters in providing procedural safeguards in the native language and that it has developed a Request for Proposal (RFP) for translating procedural safeguards in the native languages of Guam. The State reported 98% compliance with the requirement to provide needed special education and related services.</p> <p>The State reported that the remaining 24 individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and the 37 individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 under Indicator 13 were corrected by March 31, 2009. The State reported that it remains out of compliance with Indicators 11 and 13.</p>	<p>2005 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>As noted in the April 1, 2009 verification letter, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, in addition to providing the required data under Indicator 15, GPSS must provide data on the number of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 (2008-2009) based on the SPED Data System Review. GPSS must also provide data under Indicator 15 on: (1) the timely correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 through the Compliance Review Process, the Dispute Resolution System and the SPED Data System Review; and (2) the status of correction of the longstanding findings of noncompliance regarding overdue IEPs and overdue reevaluations.</p> <p>The State reported that remaining noncompliance identified prior to FFY 2006 was not corrected. The State’s failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises questions about the effectiveness of the State’s general supervision system. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that it has corrected this noncompliance.</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 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the</p>

Guam Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2007 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d (b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e) and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State’s monitoring system, through the State’s data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that each program with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12 and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on five complaints. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due</p>	<p>The State reported that it did not receive any requests for due process hearings</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the</p>

Guam Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>that were fully adjudicated during the reporting period.</p>	<p>State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<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 two of two resolution sessions resulted in a settlement agreement.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2007. 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>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that the one mediation resulted in a mediation agreement.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2007. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 86.3%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>