

Federated States of Micronesia Part B FFY 2010 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>FSM’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 77%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 95%. FSM did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 79%.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to FSM’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</p> |
| <p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>FSM’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 2.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 7.7%. FSM did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 1.0%.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to FSM’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> |
| <p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets FSM’s minimum “n” size that meet FSM’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>Not applicable.</p> | <p>Not applicable.</p> |
| <p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>FSM’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 89.4% for reading and 71% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 56.5% for reading. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage for math because FSM did not administer a math assessment in FFY 2009 for students with or without disabilities. FSM did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100% for reading and math. FSM provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to FSM’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> |
| <p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement</p> | <p>FSM’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 3.4% for reading and 2.0% for math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 4.6% for reading. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage for math because FSM did not administer a math assessment in FFY 2009 for students with or without disabilities. FSM did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 5% for reading and math. FSM provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to FSM’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> |

Federated States of Micronesia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps | | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| standards. [Results Indicator] | | | | | | | |
| <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>FSM’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. FSM met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>FSM reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> | | | | | |
| <p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <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>Not applicable.</p> | <p>Not applicable.</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>FSM’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1398 1583 1500"> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1398 982 1500"></td> <td data-bbox="982 1398 1157 1500"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></td> <td data-bbox="1157 1398 1314 1500"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></td> <td data-bbox="1314 1398 1472 1500"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></td> <td data-bbox="1472 1398 1583 1500"><u>Progress</u></td> </tr> </table> | | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> | <u>Progress</u> | <p>OSEP looks forward to FSM’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> |
| | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> | <u>Progress</u> | | | |

Federated States of Micronesia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | | | | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------------------|------------------------|------|--------------------------|--|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--|------|------|------|-------------------|------|------|------|---|
| <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. [Results Indicator]</p> | A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 91 | 95 | 98 | 4.00% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 2.8 | 2 | 0.25 | 0.80% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements | 6 | 3 | 1.5 | 3.00% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. FSM did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. [Results Indicator; New]</p> | FSM is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR. | | | | | FSM must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 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</p> | <p>FSM's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1239 1583 1510"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1239 957 1341"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 1239 1163 1341"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 1239 1373 1341"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 1239 1583 1341"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1341 957 1476">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1341 1163 1476">80.3</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1341 1373 1476">89.4</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1341 1583 1476">79.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1476 957 1510">Outcome B:</td> <td data-bbox="957 1476 1163 1510">81.4</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1476 1373 1510">86.2</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1476 1583 1510">80.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | | | | <u>Summary Statement 1</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> | Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%) | 80.3 | 89.4 | 79.7 | Outcome B: | 81.4 | 86.2 | 80.1 | <p>OSEP appreciates FSM's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to FSM's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR. FSM must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.</p> |
| <u>Summary Statement 1</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%) | 80.3 | 89.4 | 79.7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome B: | 81.4 | 86.2 | 80.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Federated States of Micronesia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | | | | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</p> | | | | |
| <p>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</p> | 81.4 | 84.2 | 88 | | |
| <p align="center"><u>Summary Statement 2</u></p> | <p align="center"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></p> | <p align="center"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></p> | <p align="center"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></p> | | |
| <p>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</p> | 48.2 | 76.4 | 66 | | |
| <p>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</p> | 45.8 | 76.4 | 66 | | |
| <p>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</p> | 53 | 83.3 | 68.4 | | |
| <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. FSM met part of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p> | | | | | |
| <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. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>FSM’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 65%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 88%. FSM did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 95%. In its description of its FFY 2010 data, FSM addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p> | | | | <p>OSEP looks forward to FSM’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> |
| <p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special</p> | <p>Not applicable.</p> | | | | <p>Not applicable.</p> |

Federated States of Micronesia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|--|---|
| <p>education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>Not applicable.</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 FSM establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>FSM’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 99%. FSM met its FFY 2010 target of 100%. FSM reported that all four findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates FSM’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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>Not applicable.</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</p> | <p>FSM’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 88 %. FSM met its FFY 2010 target of 100%. FSM reported that all 33 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates FSM’s efforts in achieving compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b).</p> |

Federated States of Micronesia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|----|------|----|-------|---|----|------|----|-------|---|----|------|----|-------|---|
| <p>assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will 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>FSM’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 932 1583 1474"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td align="center">13</td> <td align="center">17.3</td> <td align="center">13</td> <td align="center">4.30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">26</td> <td align="center">28.8</td> <td align="center">26</td> <td align="center">2.80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">34</td> <td align="center">42.3</td> <td align="center">34</td> <td align="center">8.30%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. FSM met its FFY 2010 targets</p> | | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> | <u>Progress</u> | A. % Enrolled in higher education | 13 | 17.3 | 13 | 4.30% | B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed | 26 | 28.8 | 26 | 2.80% | C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed | 34 | 42.3 | 34 | 8.30% | <p>OSEP appreciates FSM’s efforts to improve performance.</p> |
| | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> | <u>Progress</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. % Enrolled in higher education | 13 | 17.3 | 13 | 4.30% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed | 26 | 28.8 | 26 | 2.80% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed | 34 | 42.3 | 34 | 8.30% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Federated States of Micronesia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>for this indicator.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, FSM addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</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 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. FSM reported that it timely corrected all 86 findings identified in FFY 2009. However, FSM did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (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 a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Specifically, FSM did not demonstrate that it corrected the one finding under Indicator 11 in Yap State because correction was not verified consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). Accordingly, OSEP recalculated FSM’s FFY 2010 data for this indicator to be 99%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 96%. FSM did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> | <p>FSM must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 that was not reported as corrected in the FFY 2010 APR was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates FSM’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, FSM’s data demonstrating that FSM timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>When reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2011 APR, FSM must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 and FFY 2009: (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 a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance,</p> |

Federated States of Micronesia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|---|--|
| | | <p>unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, FSM must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, FSM 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, 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 FSM.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>FSM reported, as of January 31, 2012, that it did not receive any signed written complaints during the FFY 2010 reporting period.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing FSM’s FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data.</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>FSM reported, as of January 31, 2012, that it did not receive any due process hearing requests during the FFY 2010 reporting period.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing FSM’s FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data.</p> |

Federated States of Micronesia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|--|---|
| [Compliance Indicator] | | |
| <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>FSM reported, as of January 31, 2012, that no resolution sessions were held during the FFY 2010 reporting period.</p> <p>FSM reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2010. FSM is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing FSM's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> |
| <p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p> | <p>FSM reported, as of January 31, 2012, that no mediations were held during the FFY 2010 reporting period.</p> <p>FSM reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2010. FSM is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing FSM's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</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 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 98.76%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. FSM did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State'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). If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance. In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the</p> |

Federated States of Micronesia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|---|---------------------------------|
| | | Indicator 20 Data Rubric. |