

Republic of the Marshall Islands Part B FFY 2009 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI revised the targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2009, FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012. The revised target for FFY 2009 is less rigorous than the previously-established target, and the revised target for FFY 2010 is more rigorous than the previously-established target.</p> <p>RMI's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 75%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 75%. RMI met its FFY 2009 target of 65%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates RMI's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>RMI provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. RMI revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>RMI's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. RMI met its FFY 2009 target of 30%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates RMI's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>This indicator is not applicable to RMI.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p>	<p>RMI provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI revised the targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, improvement activities for FFY 2010, and baseline for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2009, FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012. The revised targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 are less rigorous than the</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to RMI's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

Republic of the Marshall Islands Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	<p>previously-established targets.</p> <p>RMI's FFY 2009 revised baseline data for this indicator are 37.2% for reading and 37.2% for math. The baseline for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from RMI's reported FFY 2008 data. RMI did not meet its FFY 2009 revised target of 60%.</p> <p>RMI did not provide a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results because RMI does not publicly report these data for nondisabled students.</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, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>RMI provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI revised the targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, improvement activities for FFY 2010, and baseline for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2009, FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012. The revised targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 are less rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>RMI's FFY 2009 revised baseline data for this indicator are .03% for reading and .066% for math. However, OSEP recalculated the data for this indicator to be 3.87% for reading and 5.81% for math. The baseline for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from RMI's reported FFY 2008 data. RMI did not meet its FFY 2009 revised target of 20%.</p> <p>RMI did not provide a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results because RMI does not publicly report these data for nondisabled students.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to RMI's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>RMI provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>RMI's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. RMI met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>RMI reported its definition of "significant discrepancy."</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates RMI's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p>	<p>Indicator 4B is not applicable to RMI.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>

Republic of the Marshall Islands Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>																						
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>RMI provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. RMI revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>RMI's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1049 1583 1521"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">88.1</td> <td align="center">87.76</td> <td align="center">80</td> <td align="center">-.34%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">.5</td> <td align="center">1.25</td> <td align="center">1</td> <td align="center">-1.20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">1.1</td> <td align="center">.83</td> <td align="center">1</td> <td align="center">.17%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	88.1	87.76	80	-.34%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	.5	1.25	1	-1.20%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	1.1	.83	1	.17%	<p>OSEP appreciates RMI's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to RMI's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
	<u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	88.1	87.76	80	-.34%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	.5	1.25	1	-1.20%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	1.1	.83	1	.17%																		

Republic of the Marshall Islands Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
	These data represent progress for 5C and slippage for 5A and 5B from the FFY 2008 data. RMI met its FFY 2009 targets for 5A and 5C, but did not meet its FFY 2009 target for 5B.																	
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and</p> <p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	RMI is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2009 APR.	RMI is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.																
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 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]</p>	<p>RMI provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>RMI's FFY 2009 recalculated data for Summary Statement 1, and RMI's reported FFY 2009 data for Summary Statement 2 for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1047 1583 1518"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1047 957 1149"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 1047 1163 1149"><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 1047 1373 1149"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 1047 1583 1149"><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1149 957 1317">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1149 1163 1317">100</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1149 1373 1317">100</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1149 1583 1317">85</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1317 957 1484">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1317 1163 1484">85.7</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1317 1373 1484">93.3</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1317 1583 1484">85</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1484 957 1518">Outcome C:</td> <td data-bbox="957 1484 1163 1518"></td> <td data-bbox="1163 1484 1373 1518"></td> <td data-bbox="1373 1484 1583 1518"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	100	100	85	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	85.7	93.3	85	Outcome C:				<p>OSEP appreciates RMI's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to RMI's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>RMI must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR.</p>
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>															
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	100	100	85															
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	85.7	93.3	85															
Outcome C:																		

Republic of the Marshall Islands Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	100	92.8	85	
	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	
	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	75	33.3	40	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	75	46.6	25	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	12.54	53.3	20	
	These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2008 data. RMI met part of its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.				
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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. RMI's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 91.1%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 95%. RMI did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 95%.				OSEP looks forward to RMI's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate	This indicator is not applicable to RMI.				Not applicable.

Republic of the Marshall Islands Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>identification. [Compliance Indicator]</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>This indicator is not applicable to RMI.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>RMI provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. RMI met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates RMI's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>This indicator is not applicable to RMI.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will</p>	<p>RMI provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts RMI's submission for this indicator. RMI's FFY 2009 reported baseline data for this indicator are 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates RMI's efforts in achieving compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b).</p>

Republic of the Marshall Islands Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>		
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>RMI provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts RMI’s submission for this indicator. RMI indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012.</p> <p>RMI’s reported FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>A. 0% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. 0% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and</p> <p>C. 0% enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p>	<p>RMI must report actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system</p>	<p>RMI provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates RMI’s efforts</p>

Republic of the Marshall Islands Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>(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>FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>RMI's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. RMI met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>in timely correcting findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008.</p> <p>In reporting on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 in the FFY 2010 APR due February 1, 2012, RMI must verify that it: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the RMI data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of RMI, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2010 APR, RMI must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2010 APR, RMI 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</p>	<p>RMI provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>RMI reported that it did not receive any signed written complaints during the reporting</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing RMI's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

Republic of the Marshall Islands Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>period.</p>	
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>RMI provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>RMI reported that it did not receive any requests for due process hearings during the reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing RMI's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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>RMI provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. RMI revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>RMI reported that no resolution sessions were held during the reporting period.</p> <p>RMI reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2009. RMI is not required to meet targets or provide improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing RMI's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>RMI provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. RMI indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. RMI revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing RMI's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

Republic of the Marshall Islands Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>RMI reported that no mediations were held during the reporting period.</p> <p>RMI reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2009. RMI is not required to meet targets or provide improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.</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>RMI provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>RMI's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP recalculated the data for this indicator to be 99%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 99%. RMI did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 3, 2010 FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table required RMI to include in the FFY 2009 APR information about RMI's progress in implementing its Special Education Information Management System (SEIMS). RMI provided the required information.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates RMI's efforts and looks forward to reviewing, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, RMI's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2010 APR, RMI must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric. If RMI does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, RMI must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing information about RMI's progress in implementing SEIMS in the FFY 2010.</p>

Verification Issues		
Critical Element	Issue/Response/Analysis	Action Required
<p>GS-1: Identification of Noncompliance</p>	<p>OSEP's February 8, 2011 Verification Visit Letter required RMI to revise the RMI monitoring procedures, including procedures for identifying noncompliance with 34 CFR §§300.320 and 300.324. Specifically, OSEP's Verification Visit Letter required</p>	<p><u>Further action required:</u> Within 90 days from the date of this response, RMI must provide</p>

Republic of the Marshall Islands Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Verification Issues		
Critical Element	Issue/Response/Analysis	Action Required
	<p>RMI to include monitoring procedures for issuing written findings of noncompliance when data and information collected from on-site monitoring show noncompliance with the Part B IEP requirements at 34 CFR §§300.320 and 300.324; or if RMI chooses not to make a finding of noncompliance because the school immediately corrects the identified noncompliance for the specific child, verify that the school is correctly implementing the regulatory requirement (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a statewide data system.</p> <p>On May 6, 2011, RMI submitted its revised monitoring procedures. The revised monitoring procedures include an IEP Checklist and a Child Record Audit Form - IEP for reviewing IEP records to identify noncompliance with certain requirements under 34 CFR §§300.320 and 300.324. However, RMI's revised monitoring procedures do not include: (1) a procedure for issuing written findings of noncompliance when data and information collected from on-site monitoring show noncompliance with the Part B IEP requirements at 34 CFR §§300.320 and 300.324; or if RMI chooses not to make a finding of noncompliance because the school immediately corrects the identified noncompliance for the specific child, that RMI verifies correction consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02; and 2) complete procedures for 34 CFR §§300.320 (a)(2)(i) and 300.320 (a)(5).</p>	<p>OSEP with revised written monitoring procedures that include procedures requiring the issuance of written findings of noncompliance when data and information collected from on-site monitoring show noncompliance with the Part B IEP requirements at 34 CFR §§300.320 and 300.324; or if RMI chooses not to make a finding of noncompliance because the school immediately corrects the identified noncompliance for the specific child, verification that the school is correctly implementing the regulatory requirement (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, RMI must include: (1) a procedure to monitor the full requirement under 34 CFR §300.320(a)(2)(i) (i.e., a statement of measurable annual goals including academic and functional goals to meet the child's needs that result from the child's disability); and (2) the requirement under 34 CFR 300.320(a)(5) (an explanation of the extent, if any, to which the child will not participate with nondisabled children in the regular class.)</p>

Republic of the Marshall Islands Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Verification Issues		
Critical Element	Issue/Response/Analysis	Action Required
GS-1: Identification of Noncompliance	<p>OSEP’s February 8, 2011 Verification Visit Letter required RMI to submit a plan for training teachers and administrators to ensure that IEPs contain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ results of the initial or most recent evaluation of the child (34 CFR §300.324(a)(iii)); ▪ a statement of the measurable annual goals for the child, including academic and functional goals, that are designed to meet the needs the child has as a result of his/her disability that is identified in the child’s evaluation (34 CFR §300.320(a)(2)(i)); ▪ information on when periodic reports on the child’s progress toward meeting the statement of annual goals will be provided (34 CFR §300.320(a)(3)(ii)); ▪ projected dates for beginning special education and related services and supplementary aids and services and program modifications or supports for school personnel that will be provided, and the anticipated frequency, location, and duration of these services (34 CFR §300.320(a)(7)); and ▪ an explanation of the extent, if any, to which the child will not participate with nondisabled children in the regular class and in activities described in 34 CFR §300.320(a)(4) (34 CFR §300.320(a)(5)). <p>On May 9, 2011, RMI submitted the required training plan.</p>	<u>No further action is required.</u>
DS-1: Collecting and Reporting Valid and Reliable Data	<p>OSEP’s February 8, 2011 Verification Visit Letter required RMI to submit a plan to ensure the accuracy of the data collected and reported in Table 4 and Table 6 for IDEA section 618 data.</p> <p>On May 9, 2011, RMI submitted the required plan.</p>	<u>Further action required:</u> In the FFY 2010 SPP/APR due February 1, 2012, RMI must provide a description under Indicator 20 of the methods RMI used to ensure that the data reported on Tables 4 and 6 are accurate.
FS-3 Appropriate Use of IDEA Funds	<p>OSEP’s February 8, 2011 Verification Visit Letter required RMI to submit to OSEP a copy of any correspondence from RMI MOE ministries within RMI that it determines make available financial support for special education and related services provided pursuant to a child’s IEP, which includes: (a) an explanation of the requirement that RMI include in its calculation of State financial support the amount of financial support provided by all ministries within RMI, as required in section 612(a)(18)(A) of the IDEA and 34 CFR §300.163(a); (b) the name and contact information of an office within RMI that is available to provide technical assistance to ministries within RMI regarding this</p>	<u>No further action is required.</u>

Republic of the Marshall Islands Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Verification Issues		
Critical Element	Issue/Response/Analysis	Action Required
	<p>requirement; (c) the name and contact information of the office within RMI to which ministries should provide information on the amount of financial support made available for special education and related services for children with IEPs; and (d) a copy of OSEP Memorandum 10-05.</p> <p>On May 9, 2011, RMI submitted the required documentation.</p>	
FS-3 Appropriate Use of IDEA Funds	<p>OSEP’s February 8, 2011 Verification Visit Letter required RMI to submit the procedures RMI uses to calculate maintenance of State financial support for special education and related services, including how RMI ensures that it will not reduce the amount of State financial support for special education and related services for children with disabilities below the amount of that support for the preceding fiscal year.</p> <p>On May 9, 2011, RMI submitted the required procedures.</p> <p>If RMI determines at a future date that funds from other RMI agencies are used to provide special education and related services, or if RMI uses general funds to pay for more than the twelve positions that were funded from RMI general funds on the day before the date of enactment of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, RMI must revise its procedures for calculating maintenance of State financial support for special education and related services and must submit those revised procedures to OSEP.</p>	<u>No further action is required at this time.</u>
FS-3 Appropriate Use of IDEA Funds	<p>OSEP’s February 8, 2011 Verification Visit Letter required RMI to submit a written assurance that RMI has utilized the methodology developed in accordance with the item above to calculate State financial support for special education and related services for fiscal year 2010, consistent with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.163(a).</p> <p>On May 9, 2011, RMI provided the required assurance.</p>	<u>No further action is required.</u>
FS-3 Appropriate Use of IDEA Funds	<p>OSEP’s February 8, 2011 Verification Visit Letter required RMI to submit a copy of the correspondence in which RMI informed its audit office of the need to review RMI’s compliance with the State financial support requirements in section 612(a)(18)(A) of the IDEA and 34 CFR §300.163(a) as part of any audit conducted under the Single Audit Act and OMB Circular A-133.</p> <p>RMI provided, as “Attachment F” to its Verification Visit Progress Report, a copy of RMI MOE’s April 28, 2011 letter to the Minister of Finance regarding the need to review RMI’s compliance with the State financial support requirements in section</p>	<u>Further action required:</u> Within 90 days from the date of this response, RMI must provide OSEP with documentation showing that a copy of the April 28, 2011 letter to the Minister of Finance regarding State financial support requirements, or a similar

Republic of the Marshall Islands Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Verification Issues		
Critical Element	Issue/Response/Analysis	Action Required
	612(a)(18)(A) of the IDEA and 34 CFR §300.163(a) as part of any audit conducted under the Single Audit Act and OMB Circular A-133. The Auditor General, who is responsible for single audits and for contracting for the audit required under the Single Audit Act, received a copy of that letter. However, RMI MOE did not provide a copy of the April 28, 2011 letter to the office that does the audits required under the Single Audit Act.	letter, was sent to the office that conducts RMI's audits under the Single Audit Act.