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# Introduction

**Instructions**

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State’s systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State’s General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

This Executive Summary includes a description of Guam's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. A description of Guam's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement in the development and review of the SPP and APR, and how Guam will report the SPP and APR to the Public are provided separately within this Introduction section of Guam's FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

For this FFY 2021 SPP/APR, Guam stakeholders maintained the targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2025. This FFY 2021 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Baseline and targets for Indicator 3C for high school in Reading and Math were determined during this FFY 2021 SPP/APR, along with revising the baseline and FFY 2025 target for Indicator 3D in High School Math. Per OSEP's instructions, Indicators 9 and 10 do not apply to Guam. In addition, Indicator 4B also does not apply to Guam. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, Guam reports FFY 2021 data to determine if Guam met its FFY 2021 target, an explanation of slippage if Guam did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from FFY 2020, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2022 OSEP SPP/APR Determination Letter for Guam's FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

Furthermore, as required for Indicator 17, Guam's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), is included in this submission for FFY 2021.

**Additional information related to data collection and reporting**

For relevant FFY 2021 APR Indicators, information is provided on the data collection and reporting that were impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic, where applicable. For any Indicator that was impacted, Guam Part B reported on the impact of performance, data completeness and the validity and reliability of the data. If there was an impact, an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically affected Guam's ability to collect the data for each impacted Indicator; and the steps Guam took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

**Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year**

1

**General Supervision System:**

**The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.**

As the GDOE is a Unitary System, the Principal of each public school is the representative of the public agency who supervises the provision of special education and related services to meet the unique needs of children with disabilities and is knowledgeable about the availability of resources of the public agency to ensure a free appropriate public education (FAPE) for students with disabilities. The Division of Special Education provides support to the public schools in order to meet the unique needs of children with disabilities and the provision of FAPE.

The Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) is under the Deputy Superintendent of Assessment and Accountability and is responsible for implementing Guam’s Integrated Monitoring System, which includes Comprehensive Monitoring, Offsite monitoring activities, and Dispute Resolution. Comprehensive Monitoring is a process that identifies and corrects procedural noncompliance with Part B IDEA requirements. It is an essential component of the Integrated Monitoring System and assists the CMO in determining a school’s strengths and weaknesses with the implementation of the IDEA and related policies and procedures. Monitoring activities include file record reviews and interviews with program personnel and parents.

The CMO manages GDOE's Dispute Resolution System (State Complaints, Due Process Hearings, and Mediations). The CMO uses the Dispute Resolution System to identify and correct noncompliance in the implementation of IDEA requirements and to identify components of the system that need improvement (e.g., policies, procedures, guidelines, written agreements). As part of the monitoring activities, the compliance office examines formal dispute resolution data of schools to identify issues related to performance and helps plan onsite or other program-specific monitoring activities.

As a result of the Pacific Convening sponsored by the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) held on Guam in October 2022, Guam is receiving targeted technical assistance to review and revise, where necessary, its entire General Supervision System which includes the state performance plan; policies, procedures and effective implementation of the general supervision system; integrated monitoring activities; fiscal management; data on processes and results; improvement, correction, incentives and sanctions; an effective dispute resolution system; and targeted technical assistance and professional development. Focus groups were developed for each area and meetings for each focus area commenced in November 2022 and is ongoing.

**Technical Assistance System:**

**The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.**

On April 19, 2022, the Guam Education Board (GEB) approved the Guam Department of Education (GDOE) State Strategic Plan (SSP), “I CHalån-ta Mo’na.” With input and support of stakeholders, the SSP is focused on seven strategic priorities: Leadership, Curriculum & Instruction, Parent Engagement, Student Discipline and Safety, Facilities and Maintenance, Finance and Administrative Services, and Data.

The goals of the strategic plan are to promote the professional learning of teachers, administrators and instructional staff to improve the quality of instruction in all classrooms; support the establishment of collaborative structures in schools and school systems to allow for identification, sharing, development and dissemination of best practices through the district; support the diverse curricular programs and multiple pathways to success such as career academies, career and technical education, academic plans, and job certification programs; support the incorporation of literacy strategies in all content areas; support the multiple data sources to determine and monitor student achievement, along with the training of staff to utilize the data; and support the alignment of district and school policies and practices towards key strategies meant to support student achievement at all levels.

In addition, Guam Part B also has a technical assistance delivery system that includes on-site technical assistance, training and support to school teams responsible for delivering services to students with disabilities and personnel from the Division. The delivery system is comprised of SPED Coaches and Program Coordinators from the Division’s Leadership Team. Based on the level of support needed by school teams, Coaches and/or Program Coordinators provide training in all aspects of the delivery of services to issues stemming from IEP stipulated services and training on topics identified through onsite and off-site compliance reviews.

There are also mechanisms in place to evaluate the effectiveness of the technical assistance, training, and support provided. Some ways in which impact measures are assessed are through the review of data compiled from the training evaluations, observations at the school sites to determine if there is any evidence of change in practices, file folder reviews, and ensuring the completion of activities described in any individual school action plans or improvement plans.

Furthermore, Guam Part B received technical assistance and support for the development of Guam’s FFY 2021 State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report through OSEP-funded TA Centers and Resources such as the NCSI, NCII, NCEO, DaSY Center, IDC, ECTAC, NTACT, WINTACT, the Progress Center, and the EDFActs Partner Support Center for the required IDEA 618 data submissions to EDEN/EDFacts. Guam Part B also partners with and receives technical assistance and support from the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS).

**Professional Development System:**

**The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.**

As part of Guam DOE’s State Strategic Plan, one of the major components is the Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and Collaborative Teams at each school. The PLCs and Collaborative Teams are structures for teachers, administrators, instructional, and support staff to come together on a regular basis to review curriculum content, share effective instructional strategies, and analyze student assessment data to monitor student progress and determine needed interventions. As a management strategy, the Collaborative Teams structure helps establish a protocol for effective communication between Divisions and groups, as well as establish goals and action steps.

Additionally, with GDOE’s mission statement: “Every student: responsible, respectful, and ready for life,” several goals were developed to improve educational outcomes for all students. Under the strategic priority of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, the goal is have all GDOE students graduate from high school prepared to engage in life-long learning and enter the economy with work ready skills necessary to thrive in 21st Century society. To achieve this, steps are taken to strengthen and diversify the curriculum at all levels, along with continuous provision of research and evidence-based professional learning opportunities, resources and implementation supports given to teachers, administrators, and instructional staff to improve the quality of the curriculum, classroom instruction, assessment systems and interventions. The mechanism in which this occurs is through the eight (8) professional development days in the GDOE School Calendar: all eight (8) days are Full-Day professional days and are designated specifically to the state-wide initiatives to support the goals in the GDOE SSP.

In addition to these designated professional development days, there are also training days identified to focus on IEP-specific related training and support and program level needs such as Safe Crisis Management, the implementation of discipline procedures for students with disabilities, the IEP Process (initial referrals, reevaluations, eligibility, developing IEPs, transition plans, common core state standards and students with disabilities), training specific to CCSS and Alternate Assessments based on Alternate Achievement Standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities, training for early childhood special education staff and Head Start staff on instructional strategies and practices that are research and evidence-based to improve the outcomes for children, most especially to promote children’s’ social-emotional skills, understanding their problem behaviors and use of positive approaches to help them learn appropriate behaviors. Monthly meetings are also held within each of the Program Units in the Division of Special Education that are focused on the programmatic needs of each Unit.

The professional development system employed by Guam ensures that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

In FFY 2020, GDOE was awarded a 5-year OSEP State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG): Project Hita Para Mo'na. This project is designed to assist GDOE in developing and implementing effective professional development for improving functional outcomes and educational results for children with disabilities, with a focus on children with autism spectrum disorder (ASD).

Today’s unprecedented new normal resulting from the global public health crisis caused by the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) requires families and providers to come together to develop a new playbook for how known evidence-based practices can be effectively implemented in unknown environments from maintaining social distancing to virtual learning. This playbook will be developed with all stakeholders, especially families of children with disabilities, to ensure meaningful application of the knowns into the unknowns of today.

To ensure the applicability of Project Hita Para Mo'na within the GDOE professional development system, GDOE established key partnerships to support the authentic stakeholder engagement through the use of the Leading by Convening framework for improvement: Autism Community Together (ACT), Guam’s local non-profit organization of families and supporters of individuals with ASD; University of Guam (UOG) Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service and School of Education, Guam’s local institution of higher education; and the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE), the national organization for leaders in special education.

**Broad Stakeholder Input:**

**The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.

- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).

- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held to review all the Indicators for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, One session was held virtually, while the other session was a hybrid presentation, whereby stakeholders had the opportunity to attend either virtually or in-person.

- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.

- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.

- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2020-2021, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.

- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.

- Two in-person sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the Logic Model, the Theory of Action, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP. Several planning meetings and core team meetings were also held throughout the year to determine next steps for the SSIP.

Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:

April 19, 2022: At a regularly scheduled Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD) meeting, compliance Indicators 11, 12, 13, along with Indicators 15 and 16, were presented. Drill down data was also presented to discuss areas of concern for Indicators 11 and 13. Those present at the meeting included parents of children with disabilities, a Guam Education Board Member, and parents who are members of the Autism Communities Together (ACT), the Down Syndrome Society, and the Guam Parent and Training Information (PTI) Center.

April 26, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with parent members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), data for Indicators 1 and 2 were presented, which included disaggregated data for each of the high schools for students with disabilities who exited the system either through graduation or dropping out.

May 9, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with GAPSD members, Indicators 5 and 6 were presented, along with disaggregated data for each of the LRE settings, to discuss reasons for slippage for 5A and 6B. Stakeholders discussed possible reasons for the slippage and ways the programs could provide support to the teachers and students with disabilities and their families so education could be provided in more inclusive settings with typically developing peers.

August 5, 2022: During the GDOE Division of Special Education’s Orientation Session (Back to School), data and performance from the Compliance Indicators 11, 12, and 13 were shared with personnel. The purpose of the presentation was two-fold: to share performance data and to review the standards of practice and expectations for Indicators 11 and 13, whereby Division personnel play an important role in meeting the compliance targets for these Indicators.

December 5, 2022: A focus group session was held with Division personnel comprised of SPED Coaches whose task is to provide technical assistance, training and support to school personnel. Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13 and 14 were presented during this session. A discussion ensued referencing possible areas of improvement, especially for Indicators 5, 11, 13 and 14.

January 3 & 9, 2023: Focus group sessions were held with personnel from the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Program comprised of teachers and services providers. The purpose was to review data from Indicators 6, 7, and 12. The group drilled down data for Indicators 6 and 7 to determine reasons for the slippage in performance. Correlations were made between the LRE and the performance in the early childhood outcomes, most especially for Indicator 7, summary statements 2 in all three outcome areas. The group then developed plans for next steps to address the slippage for Indicators 6 and 7.

January 18 & 28, 2023: The full SPP/APR for FFY 2021 was presented to stakeholders on both these dates. January 18, 2023 was delivered virtually to members from the GAPSD, family and parents from parent groups (ACT, Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI), and members from the GEB. On January 28, 2023, the full SPP/APR was also presented both in-person and virtually to Division personnel, school teachers, members from GAPSD, along with family members and parents from ACT, the Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI, a member from the GEB, and a high school student with disabilities. These presentations included the data and updates on the SSIP. Participants appreciated the information shared on the “5 Why’s” to show possible reasons for no progress on the SSIP target for FFY 2021.

For Indicator 8: Several focus groups and planning sessions were held on February 10, 2022, March 31, 2022, and July 23, 2022. Members included GDOE Division of personnel in charge of Parent Services, consultants from the University of Guam CEDDERS, and GAPSD parent members.

For Indicator 17 – SSIP: Nine planning meetings with GDOE personnel and UOG CEDDERS were held throughout the school year to ensure the SSIP schools were implementing PDSAs, conducting aimswebPlus assessments with fidelity, providing explicit instruction in reading, and overall, following the activities outlined in the SSIP. In addition to the planning meetings, seven core team meetings were held with the SSIP Principals, the teacher leaders, parents from the SSIP schools to review the Theory of Action, Logic Model, and Evaluation Plan. Two large stakeholder group meetings were also held with all personnel, inclusive of parents, from the SSIP schools on May 19, 2022 and October 13, 2022. Additionally, a session on Reading and the Continuous Improvement Cycle was held with all SSIP schools on August 9, 2022, along with a session for the scale up schools which was held on February 16, 2022.

**Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)**

YES

**Number of Parent Members:**

52

**Parent Members Engagement:**

**Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

For each of the Indicators, historical and current data was presented to show “trends” and “patterns” of performance beginning with FFY 2016 through FFY 2021. By doing this, stakeholders could see the growth or change from year to year with each of the Indicators. This was done so stakeholders could analyze the data in order to view progress or slippage towards meeting the targets.

A discussion of previous improvement strategies employed for particular Indicators, such as Indicators 11 and 13 were also discussed because of the issues with noncompliance. Division personnel conducted drill down exercises to get to the root causes of the noncompliance and for those Indicators that had slippage. These results were shared with the parent stakeholders to get their feedback. For Indicator 11, parents agreed that the designation of an “Indicator 11 Monitor,” who will track the completion of evaluations, will increase the compliance with the 60-Day Timeline. For Indicator 13, parents felt that the weekly monitoring of IEPs needs to be aggressively monitored so that schools could increase their performance and thereby, improve results for youth with IEPs. Parent members appreciated the drill down data for both the compliance and results Indicators so they could better understand the possible causes of the slippage and reasons for not meeting the targets.

During the discussion surrounding Indicator 14A, the student with a disability who attended the in-person stakeholder meeting, asked what could be done for students wanting to attend higher education after graduating from high school. This student wanted to know who in the school students could speak with about their aspirations. Parent members from GAPSD who were present at this same meeting and personnel from the GDOE Division of Special Education, provided information, along with tips and strategies students and parents should take to advocate for themselves during high school and after graduating from high school.

**Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

**The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

The SPP/APR is an extremely technical report and may be difficult to understand. With this in mind, parent stakeholders agreed that having smaller focus group sessions to discuss Indicators in clusters is the best method to review the SPP/APR. This way, parents could attend the cluster meetings or focus group sessions they are highly interested in attending or that are most pertinent to their child.

Although there were some meetings that were held in-person, the majority of the focus group meetings were held virtually. Information and handouts were provided to the participants beforehand so they would have an easier time following along with the discussions.

Flyers were distributed and emails were sent out announcing the sessions so parents could participate either in-person or virtually. Incentives in the form of gas cards or coupons were provided and issued to parents who attended any of the sessions.

Two sessions were held to discuss the FFY 2021 SPP/APR in its entirety, inclusive of the SSIP. One session was held virtually, while the other session was held both in-person and available to families via Zoom.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

Stakeholders agreed that the mechanism for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies and evaluating progress on each of the Indicators would be done through all means: small group in-person sessions, virtual sessions for both small groups and large groups, and email correspondence.

Copies of the DRAFT SPP/APR were also distributed electronically and through hard copy.

Stakeholders provided their input, ideas, and recommendations vocally, if they attended sessions in-person or virtually, and through email. The timeline for soliciting stakeholder input was set for Monday, January 30, 2023.

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.**

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation was done through the distribution of flyers at the schools and through email announcements, through placement on the district's website, and through announcements on social media.

The timeline for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies and evaluations were made available to the public by January 30, 2023 via email. Throughout the entire stakeholder process and presentation of the SPP/APR, stakeholders were apprised of the progress in each of the Indicators. By February 1, 2023, the first submission of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR will be provided to GAPSD members, with the understanding that revisions may be made upon OSEP’s review and recommendation for clarification during the week or period of clarification anticipated in April 2023.

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2020 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2020 APR in 2022, is available.**

The Guam Department of Education is a unitary system and does not have LEAs. As required, Guam’s Part B Program will report annually to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following Guam’s submission of the APR. Guam will post the generated SPP/APR pdf version for public posting and the OSEP Determination Letter and Response Table on the GDOE website at www.gdoe.net (select “GDOE Links,” under Division Links, select “Special Education,” under Grants and Reports, click on “Guam Part B State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report”), including any revisions if Guam has revised its SPP. Guam posts its complete SPP and all APRs on the GDOE website.

The link to the site is as follows: https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/2-Special%20Education/1874-State-Performance-Plan-and-Annual-Performance-Report.html

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

Guam's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In Guam's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised Guam of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required Guam to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed Guam to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. Guam must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

The Department directed Guam to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. Guam must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Guam's determination for 2022 reported a score of zero ("0") for the "long standing noncompliance" indicator in the 2022 Compliance Matrix for Guam Part B's grant special conditions and uncorrected identified noncompliance. Guam, therefore, provides the following information related to the technical assistance received and actions taken related to Guam's Part B grant special condition:

(1) The technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance: Guam continues to work with the Department's Risk Management Service (RMS) to address Guam Department of Education's (GDOE's) Special Conditions. The GDOE Comprehensive Corrective Action Plan (CCAP) describes the required activities - Letters from RMS and GDOE CCAP reports can be found on the GDOE website: http://gdoe.net; and

(2) The actions Guam took as a result of the technical assistance: Guam provides quarterly reports to RMS demonstrating progress towards addressing the Special Conditions.

Additionally, to address the uncorrected identified noncompliance and to improve results performance, Guam Part B availed itself of the technical assistance and resources from the following OSEP-funded technical assistance centers such as the IDEA Data Center (IDC), the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), the National Center for Educational Outcomes (NCEO), the National Center for Intensive Intervention (NCII), the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSY), the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT), the Workforce Innovation Technical Assistance Center (WINTAC), the Progress Center; and the Partner Support Center (PSC) for the required IDEA 618 data submissions to EDEN/EDFacts; and through the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities, Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS).

Furthermore, in October 2020, GDOE was awarded an OSEP State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG): Project Hita Para Mo'na to support its system's professional development improvements, especially during these uncertain times and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Technical assistance for the implementation of Project Hita Para Mo'na is through the partnership established with one of Guam's local parent organizations, Autism Community Together (ACT); Guam's higher education technical assistance provider and preservice program, University of Guam CEDDERS and School of Education; and the national special education leadership organization, the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE).

## Intro - OSEP Response

Guam's determinations for both 2021 and 2022 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2022 determination letter informed Guam that it must report with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance; and (2) the actions Guam took as a result of that technical assistance. Guam provided the required information.

The Department imposed Specific Conditions on Guam's IDEA Part B grant awards for the last three or more years. Those conditions are in effect at the time of the Department’s 2023 determination.

## Intro - Required Actions

Guam's IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In Guam's 2023 determination letter, the Department advised Guam of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required Guam to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed Guam to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. Guam must report, with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance; and (2) the actions Guam took as a result of that technical assistance.

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

**Measurement**

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 85.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= | 83.00% | 84.00% | 85.00% | 86.00% | 85.00% |
| Data | 90.76% | 85.42% | 85.81% | 83.33% | 85.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 86.00% | 87.00% | 88.00% | 89.00% | 90.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.

- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).

- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held to review all the Indicators for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, One session was held virtually, while the other session was a hybrid presentation, whereby stakeholders had the opportunity to attend either virtually or in-person.

- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.

- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.

- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2020-2021, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.

- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.

- Two in-person sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the Logic Model, the Theory of Action, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP. Several planning meetings and core team meetings were also held throughout the year to determine next steps for the SSIP.

Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:

April 19, 2022: At a regularly scheduled Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD) meeting, compliance Indicators 11, 12, 13, along with Indicators 15 and 16, were presented. Drill down data was also presented to discuss areas of concern for Indicators 11 and 13. Those present at the meeting included parents of children with disabilities, a Guam Education Board Member, and parents who are members of the Autism Communities Together (ACT), the Down Syndrome Society, and the Guam Parent and Training Information (PTI) Center.

April 26, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with parent members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), data for Indicators 1 and 2 were presented, which included disaggregated data for each of the high schools for students with disabilities who exited the system either through graduation or dropping out.

May 9, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with GAPSD members, Indicators 5 and 6 were presented, along with disaggregated data for each of the LRE settings, to discuss reasons for slippage for 5A and 6B. Stakeholders discussed possible reasons for the slippage and ways the programs could provide support to the teachers and students with disabilities and their families so education could be provided in more inclusive settings with typically developing peers.

August 5, 2022: During the GDOE Division of Special Education’s Orientation Session (Back to School), data and performance from the Compliance Indicators 11, 12, and 13 were shared with personnel. The purpose of the presentation was two-fold: to share performance data and to review the standards of practice and expectations for Indicators 11 and 13, whereby Division personnel play an important role in meeting the compliance targets for these Indicators.

December 5, 2022: A focus group session was held with Division personnel comprised of SPED Coaches whose task is to provide technical assistance, training and support to school personnel. Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13 and 14 were presented during this session. A discussion ensued referencing possible areas of improvement, especially for Indicators 5, 11, 13 and 14.

January 3 & 9, 2023: Focus group sessions were held with personnel from the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Program comprised of teachers and services providers. The purpose was to review data from Indicators 6, 7, and 12. The group drilled down data for Indicators 6 and 7 to determine reasons for the slippage in performance. Correlations were made between the LRE and the performance in the early childhood outcomes, most especially for Indicator 7, summary statements 2 in all three outcome areas. The group then developed plans for next steps to address the slippage for Indicators 6 and 7.

January 18 & 28, 2023: The full SPP/APR for FFY 2021 was presented to stakeholders on both these dates. January 18, 2023 was delivered virtually to members from the GAPSD, family and parents from parent groups (ACT, Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI), and members from the GEB. On January 28, 2023, the full SPP/APR was also presented both in-person and virtually to Division personnel, school teachers, members from GAPSD, along with family members and parents from ACT, the Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI, a member from the GEB, and a high school student with disabilities. These presentations included the data and updates on the SSIP. Participants appreciated the information shared on the “5 Why’s” to show possible reasons for no progress on the SSIP target for FFY 2021.

For Indicator 8: Several focus groups and planning sessions were held on February 10, 2022, March 31, 2022, and July 23, 2022. Members included GDOE Division of personnel in charge of Parent Services, consultants from the University of Guam CEDDERS, and GAPSD parent members.

For Indicator 17 – SSIP: Nine planning meetings with GDOE personnel and UOG CEDDERS were held throughout the school year to ensure the SSIP schools were implementing PDSAs, conducting aimswebPlus assessments with fidelity, providing explicit instruction in reading, and overall, following the activities outlined in the SSIP. In addition to the planning meetings, seven core team meetings were held with the SSIP Principals, the teacher leaders, parents from the SSIP schools to review the Theory of Action, Logic Model, and Evaluation Plan. Two large stakeholder group meetings were also held with all personnel, inclusive of parents, from the SSIP schools on May 19, 2022 and October 13, 2022. Additionally, a session on Reading and the Continuous Improvement Cycle was held with all SSIP schools on August 9, 2022, along with a session for the scale up schools which was held on February 16, 2022.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 112 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) |  |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) |  |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 4 |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)**  | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 112 | 116 | 85.00% | 86.00% | 96.55% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Graduation Conditions**

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.**

GDOE Board Policy #351.4 (11/27/00) states that a graduate must have a minimum of 24 credits for a high school diploma from a Guam public high school. The Exiting section of the Handbook for the Delivery of Special Education Services states that graduates are students who meet the same standards for graduation as students without disabilities. Although there is no GDOE board policy governing the requirements for students with disabilities who are parentally placed in private high schools, all private high school students must graduate with a minimum of 24 credits in order to receive a high school diploma from the private school they are attending.

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a

state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data[[1]](#footnote-2)**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 14.17% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target <= | 3.50% | 3.25% | 1.19% | 1.15% | 14.17% |
| Data | 3.24% | 3.62% | 3.58% | 2.50% | 14.17% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 14.00% | 13.50% | 13.00% | 12.50% | 12.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.

- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).

- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held to review all the Indicators for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, One session was held virtually, while the other session was a hybrid presentation, whereby stakeholders had the opportunity to attend either virtually or in-person.

- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.

- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.

- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2020-2021, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.

- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.

- Two in-person sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the Logic Model, the Theory of Action, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP. Several planning meetings and core team meetings were also held throughout the year to determine next steps for the SSIP.

Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:

April 19, 2022: At a regularly scheduled Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD) meeting, compliance Indicators 11, 12, 13, along with Indicators 15 and 16, were presented. Drill down data was also presented to discuss areas of concern for Indicators 11 and 13. Those present at the meeting included parents of children with disabilities, a Guam Education Board Member, and parents who are members of the Autism Communities Together (ACT), the Down Syndrome Society, and the Guam Parent and Training Information (PTI) Center.

April 26, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with parent members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), data for Indicators 1 and 2 were presented, which included disaggregated data for each of the high schools for students with disabilities who exited the system either through graduation or dropping out.

May 9, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with GAPSD members, Indicators 5 and 6 were presented, along with disaggregated data for each of the LRE settings, to discuss reasons for slippage for 5A and 6B. Stakeholders discussed possible reasons for the slippage and ways the programs could provide support to the teachers and students with disabilities and their families so education could be provided in more inclusive settings with typically developing peers.

August 5, 2022: During the GDOE Division of Special Education’s Orientation Session (Back to School), data and performance from the Compliance Indicators 11, 12, and 13 were shared with personnel. The purpose of the presentation was two-fold: to share performance data and to review the standards of practice and expectations for Indicators 11 and 13, whereby Division personnel play an important role in meeting the compliance targets for these Indicators.

December 5, 2022: A focus group session was held with Division personnel comprised of SPED Coaches whose task is to provide technical assistance, training and support to school personnel. Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13 and 14 were presented during this session. A discussion ensued referencing possible areas of improvement, especially for Indicators 5, 11, 13 and 14.

January 3 & 9, 2023: Focus group sessions were held with personnel from the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Program comprised of teachers and services providers. The purpose was to review data from Indicators 6, 7, and 12. The group drilled down data for Indicators 6 and 7 to determine reasons for the slippage in performance. Correlations were made between the LRE and the performance in the early childhood outcomes, most especially for Indicator 7, summary statements 2 in all three outcome areas. The group then developed plans for next steps to address the slippage for Indicators 6 and 7.

January 18 & 28, 2023: The full SPP/APR for FFY 2021 was presented to stakeholders on both these dates. January 18, 2023 was delivered virtually to members from the GAPSD, family and parents from parent groups (ACT, Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI), and members from the GEB. On January 28, 2023, the full SPP/APR was also presented both in-person and virtually to Division personnel, school teachers, members from GAPSD, along with family members and parents from ACT, the Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI, a member from the GEB, and a high school student with disabilities. These presentations included the data and updates on the SSIP. Participants appreciated the information shared on the “5 Why’s” to show possible reasons for no progress on the SSIP target for FFY 2021.

For Indicator 8: Several focus groups and planning sessions were held on February 10, 2022, March 31, 2022, and July 23, 2022. Members included GDOE Division of personnel in charge of Parent Services, consultants from the University of Guam CEDDERS, and GAPSD parent members.

For Indicator 17 – SSIP: Nine planning meetings with GDOE personnel and UOG CEDDERS were held throughout the school year to ensure the SSIP schools were implementing PDSAs, conducting aimswebPlus assessments with fidelity, providing explicit instruction in reading, and overall, following the activities outlined in the SSIP. In addition to the planning meetings, seven core team meetings were held with the SSIP Principals, the teacher leaders, parents from the SSIP schools to review the Theory of Action, Logic Model, and Evaluation Plan. Two large stakeholder group meetings were also held with all personnel, inclusive of parents, from the SSIP schools on May 19, 2022 and October 13, 2022. Additionally, a session on Reading and the Continuous Improvement Cycle was held with all SSIP schools on August 9, 2022, along with a session for the scale up schools which was held on February 16, 2022.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 112 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) |  |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) |  |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 4 |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)**  | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4 | 116 | 14.17% | 14.00% | 3.45% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth**

Guam Part B has met the target set for Indicator 2 for this FFY 2021 reporting year.

GDOE Board Policy 375: Definition of Dropout states the following:
A dropout is a person who was enrolled in a GDOE high school sometime during a given year; and after enrollment, stopped attending school without having been transferred to another school or to a high school equivalency education program recognized by the department; or incapacitated to the extent that enrollment in school or participation in an alternative high school program was possible; or graduated from high school or completed an alternative high school program recognized by the Department, within six years of the first day of enrollment in 9th grade; or expelled; or removed by law enforcement authorities and confined, thereby prohibiting the continuation of schooling.

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)**

NO

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

**Measurement**

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 55.06% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 44.75% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 32.18% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 54.02% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 45.36% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 32.57% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 60.00% | 70.00%  | 80.00% | 90.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 50.00% | 60.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 40.00% | 50.00% | 60.00% | 80.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 60.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% | 90.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 50.00% | 60.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 40.00% | 50.00% | 60.00% | 80.00% | 95.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.

- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).

- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held to review all the Indicators for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, One session was held virtually, while the other session was a hybrid presentation, whereby stakeholders had the opportunity to attend either virtually or in-person.

- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.

- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.

- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2020-2021, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.

- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.

- Two in-person sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the Logic Model, the Theory of Action, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP. Several planning meetings and core team meetings were also held throughout the year to determine next steps for the SSIP.

Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:

April 19, 2022: At a regularly scheduled Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD) meeting, compliance Indicators 11, 12, 13, along with Indicators 15 and 16, were presented. Drill down data was also presented to discuss areas of concern for Indicators 11 and 13. Those present at the meeting included parents of children with disabilities, a Guam Education Board Member, and parents who are members of the Autism Communities Together (ACT), the Down Syndrome Society, and the Guam Parent and Training Information (PTI) Center.

April 26, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with parent members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), data for Indicators 1 and 2 were presented, which included disaggregated data for each of the high schools for students with disabilities who exited the system either through graduation or dropping out.

May 9, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with GAPSD members, Indicators 5 and 6 were presented, along with disaggregated data for each of the LRE settings, to discuss reasons for slippage for 5A and 6B. Stakeholders discussed possible reasons for the slippage and ways the programs could provide support to the teachers and students with disabilities and their families so education could be provided in more inclusive settings with typically developing peers.

August 5, 2022: During the GDOE Division of Special Education’s Orientation Session (Back to School), data and performance from the Compliance Indicators 11, 12, and 13 were shared with personnel. The purpose of the presentation was two-fold: to share performance data and to review the standards of practice and expectations for Indicators 11 and 13, whereby Division personnel play an important role in meeting the compliance targets for these Indicators.

December 5, 2022: A focus group session was held with Division personnel comprised of SPED Coaches whose task is to provide technical assistance, training and support to school personnel. Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13 and 14 were presented during this session. A discussion ensued referencing possible areas of improvement, especially for Indicators 5, 11, 13 and 14.

January 3 & 9, 2023: Focus group sessions were held with personnel from the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Program comprised of teachers and services providers. The purpose was to review data from Indicators 6, 7, and 12. The group drilled down data for Indicators 6 and 7 to determine reasons for the slippage in performance. Correlations were made between the LRE and the performance in the early childhood outcomes, most especially for Indicator 7, summary statements 2 in all three outcome areas. The group then developed plans for next steps to address the slippage for Indicators 6 and 7.

January 18 & 28, 2023: The full SPP/APR for FFY 2021 was presented to stakeholders on both these dates. January 18, 2023 was delivered virtually to members from the GAPSD, family and parents from parent groups (ACT, Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI), and members from the GEB. On January 28, 2023, the full SPP/APR was also presented both in-person and virtually to Division personnel, school teachers, members from GAPSD, along with family members and parents from ACT, the Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI, a member from the GEB, and a high school student with disabilities. These presentations included the data and updates on the SSIP. Participants appreciated the information shared on the “5 Why’s” to show possible reasons for no progress on the SSIP target for FFY 2021.

For Indicator 8: Several focus groups and planning sessions were held on February 10, 2022, March 31, 2022, and July 23, 2022. Members included GDOE Division of personnel in charge of Parent Services, consultants from the University of Guam CEDDERS, and GAPSD parent members.

For Indicator 17 – SSIP: Nine planning meetings with GDOE personnel and UOG CEDDERS were held throughout the school year to ensure the SSIP schools were implementing PDSAs, conducting aimswebPlus assessments with fidelity, providing explicit instruction in reading, and overall, following the activities outlined in the SSIP. In addition to the planning meetings, seven core team meetings were held with the SSIP Principals, the teacher leaders, parents from the SSIP schools to review the Theory of Action, Logic Model, and Evaluation Plan. Two large stakeholder group meetings were also held with all personnel, inclusive of parents, from the SSIP schools on May 19, 2022 and October 13, 2022. Additionally, a session on Reading and the Continuous Improvement Cycle was held with all SSIP schools on August 9, 2022, along with a session for the scale up schools which was held on February 16, 2022.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | x[[2]](#footnote-3) | x2 | 234 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | x2 | x2 | 6 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 75 | 118 | 113 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 22 | 14 | 6 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | x2 | x2 | 234 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | x2 | x2 | 6 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 74 | 118 | 114 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 21 | 14 | 6 |

\*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | x2 | x2 | 55.06% | 60.00% | x2 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | x2 | x2 | 44.75% | 50.00% | x2 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 125 | 234 | 32.18% | 40.00% | 53.42% | Met target | No Slippage |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | x2 | x2 | 54.02% | 60.00% | x2 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | x2 | x2 | 45.36% | 50.00% | x2 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 126 | 234 | 32.57% | 40.00% | 53.85% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

The links listed below are where public reports of assessment results are located in the Guam Department of Education (GDOE) website. The first link is for the Annual State of Public Education Report (ASPER). The second link is for the individual school report cards.

1. https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/8-Research-Planning-and-Evaluation/Portal/annual-state-of-public-education-report

2. https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/2-Special-Education/1868-SPED-School-Report-Cards.html

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3A - OSEP Response

## 3A - Required Actions

# Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 0.00% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 1.47% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 1.79% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 0.00% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 0.00% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 1.75% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 3.00% | 5.00% | 7.00% | 9.00% | 11.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 3.00% | 5.00% | 7.00% | 9.00% | 11.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 3.00% | 5.00% | 7.00% | 9.00% | 11.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 3.00% | 5.00% | 7.00% | 9.00% | 11.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 3.00% | 5.00% | 7.00% | 9.00% | 11.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 3.00% | 5.00% | 7.00% | 9.00% | 11.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.

- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).

- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held to review all the Indicators for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, One session was held virtually, while the other session was a hybrid presentation, whereby stakeholders had the opportunity to attend either virtually or in-person.

- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.

- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.

- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2020-2021, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.

- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.

- Two in-person sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the Logic Model, the Theory of Action, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP. Several planning meetings and core team meetings were also held throughout the year to determine next steps for the SSIP.

Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:

April 19, 2022: At a regularly scheduled Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD) meeting, compliance Indicators 11, 12, 13, along with Indicators 15 and 16, were presented. Drill down data was also presented to discuss areas of concern for Indicators 11 and 13. Those present at the meeting included parents of children with disabilities, a Guam Education Board Member, and parents who are members of the Autism Communities Together (ACT), the Down Syndrome Society, and the Guam Parent and Training Information (PTI) Center.

April 26, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with parent members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), data for Indicators 1 and 2 were presented, which included disaggregated data for each of the high schools for students with disabilities who exited the system either through graduation or dropping out.

May 9, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with GAPSD members, Indicators 5 and 6 were presented, along with disaggregated data for each of the LRE settings, to discuss reasons for slippage for 5A and 6B. Stakeholders discussed possible reasons for the slippage and ways the programs could provide support to the teachers and students with disabilities and their families so education could be provided in more inclusive settings with typically developing peers.

August 5, 2022: During the GDOE Division of Special Education’s Orientation Session (Back to School), data and performance from the Compliance Indicators 11, 12, and 13 were shared with personnel. The purpose of the presentation was two-fold: to share performance data and to review the standards of practice and expectations for Indicators 11 and 13, whereby Division personnel play an important role in meeting the compliance targets for these Indicators.

December 5, 2022: A focus group session was held with Division personnel comprised of SPED Coaches whose task is to provide technical assistance, training and support to school personnel. Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13 and 14 were presented during this session. A discussion ensued referencing possible areas of improvement, especially for Indicators 5, 11, 13 and 14.

January 3 & 9, 2023: Focus group sessions were held with personnel from the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Program comprised of teachers and services providers. The purpose was to review data from Indicators 6, 7, and 12. The group drilled down data for Indicators 6 and 7 to determine reasons for the slippage in performance. Correlations were made between the LRE and the performance in the early childhood outcomes, most especially for Indicator 7, summary statements 2 in all three outcome areas. The group then developed plans for next steps to address the slippage for Indicators 6 and 7.

January 18 & 28, 2023: The full SPP/APR for FFY 2021 was presented to stakeholders on both these dates. January 18, 2023 was delivered virtually to members from the GAPSD, family and parents from parent groups (ACT, Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI), and members from the GEB. On January 28, 2023, the full SPP/APR was also presented both in-person and virtually to Division personnel, school teachers, members from GAPSD, along with family members and parents from ACT, the Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI, a member from the GEB, and a high school student with disabilities. These presentations included the data and updates on the SSIP. Participants appreciated the information shared on the “5 Why’s” to show possible reasons for no progress on the SSIP target for FFY 2021.

For Indicator 8: Several focus groups and planning sessions were held on February 10, 2022, March 31, 2022, and July 23, 2022. Members included GDOE Division of personnel in charge of Parent Services, consultants from the University of Guam CEDDERS, and GAPSD parent members.

For Indicator 17 – SSIP: Nine planning meetings with GDOE personnel and UOG CEDDERS were held throughout the school year to ensure the SSIP schools were implementing PDSAs, conducting aimswebPlus assessments with fidelity, providing explicit instruction in reading, and overall, following the activities outlined in the SSIP. In addition to the planning meetings, seven core team meetings were held with the SSIP Principals, the teacher leaders, parents from the SSIP schools to review the Theory of Action, Logic Model, and Evaluation Plan. Two large stakeholder group meetings were also held with all personnel, inclusive of parents, from the SSIP schools on May 19, 2022 and October 13, 2022. Additionally, a session on Reading and the Continuous Improvement Cycle was held with all SSIP schools on August 9, 2022, along with a session for the scale up schools which was held on February 16, 2022.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 77 | 119 | 119 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x[[3]](#footnote-4) | x3 | x3 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x3 | 10 | x3 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 76 | 119 | 120 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x3 | x3 | x3 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x3 | 5 | x3 |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | x3 | 77 | x3 | 3.00% | x3 | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | x3 | 119 | x3 | 3.00% | x3 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | x3 | 119 | x3 | 3.00% | x3 | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

The reasons for slippage in Indicator 3B Reading for HS Grade are as follows: Beginning November 29, 2021, GDOE opened its doors for students to receive in-person learning five days weekly. Not all GDOE students returned to school full force, however. There were parents who were still hesitant to have their children return to school in-person. As a result, GDOE continued to provide -- on a small scale -- online learning.

Five months later in April 2022, the district-wide assessment was administered to GDOE students who were receiving in-person instruction.

These factors impacted and manifested itself in the low performance of all students with disabilities in the district-wide assessment for this reporting period. The participation rate of students with disabilities taking the assessment is lower than normal, with only 80% to 87% participating in the assessment; and the low proficiency scores in all grades were indicative of the four full months of instruction.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | x[[4]](#footnote-5) | 76 | x4 | 3.00% | x4 | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | x4 | 119 | x4 | 3.00% | x4 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | x4 | 120 | x4 | 3.00% | x4 | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

The reasons for slippage remain the same as what was reported for Group C for Reading: students with and without disabilities have not had the opportunity of a full year of instruction, whether the instruction was delivered online or in-person. This shortened period of instruction, along with the method of the delivery of instruction, has manifested itself in low performing scores for students with disabilities in all grades in the district-wide assessment reported for FFY 2021.

**Regulatory Information**
**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

The links listed below are where public reports of assessment results are located in the Guam Department of Education (GDOE) website. The first link is for the Annual State of Public Education Report (ASPER). The second link is for the individual school report cards.

1. https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/8-Research-Planning-and-Evaluation/Portal/annual-state-of-public-education-report

2. https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/2-Special-Education/1868-SPED-School-Report-Cards.html

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

## 3B - Required Actions

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time

of testing.

## 3C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | x[[5]](#footnote-6) |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | x5 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2021 | x5 |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | x5 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 38.46% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2021 | x5 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 2.00% | 3.00% | 4.00% | 5.00% | 6.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 8.00% | 8.50% | 9.00% | 9.50% | 10.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | x5 | 34.00% | 35.00% | 36.00% | 37.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 11.00% | 12.00% | 13.00% | 14.00% | 21.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 11.00% | 12.00% | 13.00% | 14.00% | 39.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | x5 | 34.00% | 35.00% | 36.00% | 37.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.

- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).

- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held to review all the Indicators for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, One session was held virtually, while the other session was a hybrid presentation, whereby stakeholders had the opportunity to attend either virtually or in-person.

- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.

- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.

- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2020-2021, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.

- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.

- Two in-person sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the Logic Model, the Theory of Action, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP. Several planning meetings and core team meetings were also held throughout the year to determine next steps for the SSIP.

Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:

April 19, 2022: At a regularly scheduled Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD) meeting, compliance Indicators 11, 12, 13, along with Indicators 15 and 16, were presented. Drill down data was also presented to discuss areas of concern for Indicators 11 and 13. Those present at the meeting included parents of children with disabilities, a Guam Education Board Member, and parents who are members of the Autism Communities Together (ACT), the Down Syndrome Society, and the Guam Parent and Training Information (PTI) Center.

April 26, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with parent members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), data for Indicators 1 and 2 were presented, which included disaggregated data for each of the high schools for students with disabilities who exited the system either through graduation or dropping out.

May 9, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with GAPSD members, Indicators 5 and 6 were presented, along with disaggregated data for each of the LRE settings, to discuss reasons for slippage for 5A and 6B. Stakeholders discussed possible reasons for the slippage and ways the programs could provide support to the teachers and students with disabilities and their families so education could be provided in more inclusive settings with typically developing peers.

August 5, 2022: During the GDOE Division of Special Education’s Orientation Session (Back to School), data and performance from the Compliance Indicators 11, 12, and 13 were shared with personnel. The purpose of the presentation was two-fold: to share performance data and to review the standards of practice and expectations for Indicators 11 and 13, whereby Division personnel play an important role in meeting the compliance targets for these Indicators.

December 5, 2022: A focus group session was held with Division personnel comprised of SPED Coaches whose task is to provide technical assistance, training and support to school personnel. Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13 and 14 were presented during this session. A discussion ensued referencing possible areas of improvement, especially for Indicators 5, 11, 13 and 14.

January 3 & 9, 2023: Focus group sessions were held with personnel from the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Program comprised of teachers and services providers. The purpose was to review data from Indicators 6, 7, and 12. The group drilled down data for Indicators 6 and 7 to determine reasons for the slippage in performance. Correlations were made between the LRE and the performance in the early childhood outcomes, most especially for Indicator 7, summary statements 2 in all three outcome areas. The group then developed plans for next steps to address the slippage for Indicators 6 and 7.

January 18 & 28, 2023: The full SPP/APR for FFY 2021 was presented to stakeholders on both these dates. January 18, 2023 was delivered virtually to members from the GAPSD, family and parents from parent groups (ACT, Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI), and members from the GEB. On January 28, 2023, the full SPP/APR was also presented both in-person and virtually to Division personnel, school teachers, members from GAPSD, along with family members and parents from ACT, the Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI, a member from the GEB, and a high school student with disabilities. These presentations included the data and updates on the SSIP. Participants appreciated the information shared on the “5 Why’s” to show possible reasons for no progress on the SSIP target for FFY 2021.

For Indicator 8: Several focus groups and planning sessions were held on February 10, 2022, March 31, 2022, and July 23, 2022. Members included GDOE Division of personnel in charge of Parent Services, consultants from the University of Guam CEDDERS, and GAPSD parent members.

For Indicator 17 – SSIP: Nine planning meetings with GDOE personnel and UOG CEDDERS were held throughout the school year to ensure the SSIP schools were implementing PDSAs, conducting aimswebPlus assessments with fidelity, providing explicit instruction in reading, and overall, following the activities outlined in the SSIP. In addition to the planning meetings, seven core team meetings were held with the SSIP Principals, the teacher leaders, parents from the SSIP schools to review the Theory of Action, Logic Model, and Evaluation Plan. Two large stakeholder group meetings were also held with all personnel, inclusive of parents, from the SSIP schools on May 19, 2022 and October 13, 2022. Additionally, a session on Reading and the Continuous Improvement Cycle was held with all SSIP schools on August 9, 2022, along with a session for the scale up schools which was held on February 16, 2022.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 22 | 14 | 6 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | x[[6]](#footnote-7) | x6 | x6 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 21 | 14 | 6 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 6 | x6 | x6 |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | x6 | 22 | x6 | 2.00% | x6 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | x6 | 14 | x6 | 8.00% | x6 | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | x6 | 6 | x6 | x6 | x6 | N/A | N/A |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

The reasons for slippage in Indicator 3C Group B for Reading are as follows: Beginning November 29, 2021, GDOE opened its doors for students to receive in-person learning five days weekly. Not all GDOE students returned to school full force, however. There were parents who were still hesitant to have their children return to school in-person. As a result, GDOE continued to provide -- on a small scale -- online learning.

Four months later in April 2022, the district-wide assessment was administered to GDOE students who were receiving in-person instruction. Students who were receiving their instruction online were asked and encouraged to come to their school campuses so they could be assessed in-person.

These factors impacted and manifested itself in the low performance of students with disabilities in the district-wide assessment for this reporting period. The participation rate of students with disabilities taking the assessment is lower than normal, with only 80% to 87% participating in the assessment; and the low proficiency scores were indicative of the four full months of instruction.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 6 | 21 | x[[7]](#footnote-8) | 11.00% | 28.57% | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | x7 | 14 | 38.46% | 11.00% | x7 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | x7 | 6 | x7 | x7 | x7 | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

The links listed below are where public reports of assessment results are located in the Guam Department of Education (GDOE) website. The first link is for the Annual State of Public Education Report (ASPER). The second link is for the individual school report cards.

1. https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/8-Research-Planning-and-Evaluation/Portal/annual-state-of-public-education-report

2. https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/2-Special-Education/1868-SPED-School-Report-Cards.html

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

For this FFY 2021 reporting period, data was available for HS Reading and Math. Using the data for this reporting period, the baseline was established and targets for FFY 2021 through FFY 2025 were determined by stakeholders during one of the focus group sessions.

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not provide baseline and targets for HS Reading and Math. The State must provide the baseline and required targets for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

For FFY 2021, Guam Part B has provided the baseline and targets for HS Reading and Math in the section: 3C Indicator Data.

## 3C - OSEP Response

Guam has established baselines for high school reading and math under this indicator using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts those baselines.

Guam set its targets for high school reading and math under this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 3C - Required Actions

# Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3D - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 12.38 |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 16.57 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 6.68 |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 3.79 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 2.10 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2021 | 8.17 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A <= | Grade 4 | 12.00 | 11.50  | 11.00 | 10.50 | 10.00 |
| Reading | B <= | Grade 8 | 16.00 | 15.50 | 15.00 | 14.50 | 14.00 |
| Reading | C <= | Grade HS | 6.40 | 6.20 | 6.00 | 5.80 | 5.60 |
| Math | A <= | Grade 4 | 3.60 | 3.40 | 3.20 | 3.00 | 2.80 |
| Math | B <= | Grade 8 | 1.85 | 1.65 | 1.45 | 1.25 | 1.00 |
| Math | C <= | Grade HS | 8.17 | 1.65 | 1.45 | 1.25 | 1.05 |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.

- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).

- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held to review all the Indicators for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, One session was held virtually, while the other session was a hybrid presentation, whereby stakeholders had the opportunity to attend either virtually or in-person.

- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.

- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.

- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2020-2021, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.

- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.

- Two in-person sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the Logic Model, the Theory of Action, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP. Several planning meetings and core team meetings were also held throughout the year to determine next steps for the SSIP.

Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:

April 19, 2022: At a regularly scheduled Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD) meeting, compliance Indicators 11, 12, 13, along with Indicators 15 and 16, were presented. Drill down data was also presented to discuss areas of concern for Indicators 11 and 13. Those present at the meeting included parents of children with disabilities, a Guam Education Board Member, and parents who are members of the Autism Communities Together (ACT), the Down Syndrome Society, and the Guam Parent and Training Information (PTI) Center.

April 26, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with parent members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), data for Indicators 1 and 2 were presented, which included disaggregated data for each of the high schools for students with disabilities who exited the system either through graduation or dropping out.

May 9, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with GAPSD members, Indicators 5 and 6 were presented, along with disaggregated data for each of the LRE settings, to discuss reasons for slippage for 5A and 6B. Stakeholders discussed possible reasons for the slippage and ways the programs could provide support to the teachers and students with disabilities and their families so education could be provided in more inclusive settings with typically developing peers.

August 5, 2022: During the GDOE Division of Special Education’s Orientation Session (Back to School), data and performance from the Compliance Indicators 11, 12, and 13 were shared with personnel. The purpose of the presentation was two-fold: to share performance data and to review the standards of practice and expectations for Indicators 11 and 13, whereby Division personnel play an important role in meeting the compliance targets for these Indicators.

December 5, 2022: A focus group session was held with Division personnel comprised of SPED Coaches whose task is to provide technical assistance, training and support to school personnel. Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13 and 14 were presented during this session. A discussion ensued referencing possible areas of improvement, especially for Indicators 5, 11, 13 and 14.

January 3 & 9, 2023: Focus group sessions were held with personnel from the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Program comprised of teachers and services providers. The purpose was to review data from Indicators 6, 7, and 12. The group drilled down data for Indicators 6 and 7 to determine reasons for the slippage in performance. Correlations were made between the LRE and the performance in the early childhood outcomes, most especially for Indicator 7, summary statements 2 in all three outcome areas. The group then developed plans for next steps to address the slippage for Indicators 6 and 7.

January 18 & 28, 2023: The full SPP/APR for FFY 2021 was presented to stakeholders on both these dates. January 18, 2023 was delivered virtually to members from the GAPSD, family and parents from parent groups (ACT, Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI), and members from the GEB. On January 28, 2023, the full SPP/APR was also presented both in-person and virtually to Division personnel, school teachers, members from GAPSD, along with family members and parents from ACT, the Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI, a member from the GEB, and a high school student with disabilities. These presentations included the data and updates on the SSIP. Participants appreciated the information shared on the “5 Why’s” to show possible reasons for no progress on the SSIP target for FFY 2021.

For Indicator 8: Several focus groups and planning sessions were held on February 10, 2022, March 31, 2022, and July 23, 2022. Members included GDOE Division of personnel in charge of Parent Services, consultants from the University of Guam CEDDERS, and GAPSD parent members.

For Indicator 17 – SSIP: Nine planning meetings with GDOE personnel and UOG CEDDERS were held throughout the school year to ensure the SSIP schools were implementing PDSAs, conducting aimswebPlus assessments with fidelity, providing explicit instruction in reading, and overall, following the activities outlined in the SSIP. In addition to the planning meetings, seven core team meetings were held with the SSIP Principals, the teacher leaders, parents from the SSIP schools to review the Theory of Action, Logic Model, and Evaluation Plan. Two large stakeholder group meetings were also held with all personnel, inclusive of parents, from the SSIP schools on May 19, 2022 and October 13, 2022. Additionally, a session on Reading and the Continuous Improvement Cycle was held with all SSIP schools on August 9, 2022, along with a session for the scale up schools which was held on February 16, 2022.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 1,770 | 1,666 | 1,751 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 77 | 119 | 119 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x[[8]](#footnote-9) | x8 | x8 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x8 | 10 | x8 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x8 | x8 | x8 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x8 | 10 | x8 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 1,770 | 1,666 | 1,751 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 76 | 119 | 120 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x8 | x8 | x8 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x8 | 5 | x8 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x8 | x8 | x8 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x8 | 5 | x8 |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | x[[9]](#footnote-10) | x9 | 12.38 | 12.00 | 18.98 | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | x9 | x9 | 16.57 | 16.00 | 29.83 | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | x9 | x9 | 6.68 | 6.40 | 27.45 | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable**

The reasons for slippage in Indicator 3D, Groups A, B, and C, in Reading are as follows: Beginning November 29, 2021, GDOE opened its doors for students to receive in-person learning five days weekly. Not all GDOE students returned to school full force, however. There were parents who were still hesitant to have their children return to school in-person. As a result, GDOE continued to provide -- on a small scale -- online learning.

Four months later in April 2022, the district-wide assessment was administered to GDOE students who were receiving in-person instruction. Students who were receiving their instruction online were asked and encouraged to come to school so they could participate in the assessment in-person.

These factors impacted and manifested itself in the low performance of all students in the district-wide assessment for this reporting period. The participation rate of students taking the assessment is lower than normal, with only 80% to 87% participating in the assessment; and the low proficiency scores were indicative of the four full months of instruction.

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

The reasons for slippage remain the same as what was reported in Group A: students with and without disabilities have not had the opportunity of a full year of instruction, whether the instruction was delivered online or in-person. This shortened period of instruction, along with the method of the delivery of instruction, has manifested itself in low performing scores in the district-wide assessment reported for FFY 2021.

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

The reasons for slippage remain the same as what was reported in Group A: students with and without disabilities have not had the opportunity of a full year of instruction, whether the instruction was delivered online or in-person. This shortened period of instruction, along with the method of the delivery of instruction, has manifested itself in low performing scores in the district-wide assessment reported for FFY 2021.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | x9 | x9 | 3.79 | 3.60 | 4.01 | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | x9 | x9 | 2.10 | 1.85 | 10.50 | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | x9 | x9 | -0.53 | 8.17 | 8.17 | N/A | N/A |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable**

The reasons for slippage in Indicator 3D, Groups A, B, and C, in Math are as follows: Beginning November 29, 2021, GDOE opened its doors for students to receive in-person learning five days weekly. Not all GDOE students returned to school full force, however. There were parents who were still hesitant to have their children return to school in-person. As a result, GDOE continued to provide -- on a small scale -- online learning.

Four months later in April 2022, the district-wide assessment was administered to GDOE students who were receiving in-person instruction. Students who were receiving instruction online were asked and encouraged to come to school so they could participate in the assessment in-person.

These factors impacted and manifested itself in the low performance of all students in the district-wide assessment for this reporting period. The participation rate of students taking the assessment is lower than normal, with only 80% to 87% participating in the assessment; and the low proficiency scores were indicative of the four full months of instruction.

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

The reasons for slippage remain the same as what was reported in Group A: students with and without disabilities have not had the opportunity of a full year of instruction, whether the instruction was delivered online or in-person. This shortened period of instruction, along with the method of the delivery of instruction, has manifested itself in low performing scores in the district-wide assessment reported for FFY 2021.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

As part of the Prior FFY Required Actions, Guam was required to revisit its baseline for HS Math and the FFY 2025 target for HS Math to show improvement over time from its baseline. With stakeholder input, Guam revised the baseline and FFY 2025 target for HS Math.

## 3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, Guam will need to revise its baseline year for this indicator in High School Math in order to ensure comparability of baseline data and target data. Guam may also need to revise its FFY 2025 target for High School Math accordingly, to reflect improvement over the revised baseline data.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

Guam Response:
For FFY 2021, Guam revised its baseline year for High School Math. Guam also revised its FFY 2025 target for High School Math to reflect improvement over the revised baseline data. The revisions could be found in the section: 3D - Indicator Data.

## 3D - OSEP Response

Guam has revised baseline for high school math under this indicator using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Guam revised its FFY2025 target for high school math under this indicator, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 3D - Required Actions

# Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) 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 that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.

- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).

- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held to review all the Indicators for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, One session was held virtually, while the other session was a hybrid presentation, whereby stakeholders had the opportunity to attend either virtually or in-person.

- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.

- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.

- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2020-2021, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.

- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.

- Two in-person sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the Logic Model, the Theory of Action, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP. Several planning meetings and core team meetings were also held throughout the year to determine next steps for the SSIP.

Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:

April 19, 2022: At a regularly scheduled Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD) meeting, compliance Indicators 11, 12, 13, along with Indicators 15 and 16, were presented. Drill down data was also presented to discuss areas of concern for Indicators 11 and 13. Those present at the meeting included parents of children with disabilities, a Guam Education Board Member, and parents who are members of the Autism Communities Together (ACT), the Down Syndrome Society, and the Guam Parent and Training Information (PTI) Center.

April 26, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with parent members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), data for Indicators 1 and 2 were presented, which included disaggregated data for each of the high schools for students with disabilities who exited the system either through graduation or dropping out.

May 9, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with GAPSD members, Indicators 5 and 6 were presented, along with disaggregated data for each of the LRE settings, to discuss reasons for slippage for 5A and 6B. Stakeholders discussed possible reasons for the slippage and ways the programs could provide support to the teachers and students with disabilities and their families so education could be provided in more inclusive settings with typically developing peers.

August 5, 2022: During the GDOE Division of Special Education’s Orientation Session (Back to School), data and performance from the Compliance Indicators 11, 12, and 13 were shared with personnel. The purpose of the presentation was two-fold: to share performance data and to review the standards of practice and expectations for Indicators 11 and 13, whereby Division personnel play an important role in meeting the compliance targets for these Indicators.

December 5, 2022: A focus group session was held with Division personnel comprised of SPED Coaches whose task is to provide technical assistance, training and support to school personnel. Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13 and 14 were presented during this session. A discussion ensued referencing possible areas of improvement, especially for Indicators 5, 11, 13 and 14.

January 3 & 9, 2023: Focus group sessions were held with personnel from the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Program comprised of teachers and services providers. The purpose was to review data from Indicators 6, 7, and 12. The group drilled down data for Indicators 6 and 7 to determine reasons for the slippage in performance. Correlations were made between the LRE and the performance in the early childhood outcomes, most especially for Indicator 7, summary statements 2 in all three outcome areas. The group then developed plans for next steps to address the slippage for Indicators 6 and 7.

January 18 & 28, 2023: The full SPP/APR for FFY 2021 was presented to stakeholders on both these dates. January 18, 2023 was delivered virtually to members from the GAPSD, family and parents from parent groups (ACT, Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI), and members from the GEB. On January 28, 2023, the full SPP/APR was also presented both in-person and virtually to Division personnel, school teachers, members from GAPSD, along with family members and parents from ACT, the Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI, a member from the GEB, and a high school student with disabilities. These presentations included the data and updates on the SSIP. Participants appreciated the information shared on the “5 Why’s” to show possible reasons for no progress on the SSIP target for FFY 2021.

For Indicator 8: Several focus groups and planning sessions were held on February 10, 2022, March 31, 2022, and July 23, 2022. Members included GDOE Division of personnel in charge of Parent Services, consultants from the University of Guam CEDDERS, and GAPSD parent members.

For Indicator 17 – SSIP: Nine planning meetings with GDOE personnel and UOG CEDDERS were held throughout the school year to ensure the SSIP schools were implementing PDSAs, conducting aimswebPlus assessments with fidelity, providing explicit instruction in reading, and overall, following the activities outlined in the SSIP. In addition to the planning meetings, seven core team meetings were held with the SSIP Principals, the teacher leaders, parents from the SSIP schools to review the Theory of Action, Logic Model, and Evaluation Plan. Two large stakeholder group meetings were also held with all personnel, inclusive of parents, from the SSIP schools on May 19, 2022 and October 13, 2022. Additionally, a session on Reading and the Continuous Improvement Cycle was held with all SSIP schools on August 9, 2022, along with a session for the scale up schools which was held on February 16, 2022.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

NO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of LEAs in the State** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 1 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))**

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

Guam’s definition of “significant discrepancy”: GDOE is a unitary system and does not have local education agencies. Guam’s method of determining whether there were significant discrepancies occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities was done by comparing the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities to the rates for non-disabled children. In FFY 2008, Guam’s definition for “significant discrepancy” was revised as follows: Significant discrepancy is determined when children with disabilities have long term suspension and expulsion at a rate three times that of children without disabilities.

METHODOLOGY

The enrollment data for students with disabilities on September 30th for SY 2020-2021 was 1783 students. The enrollment data for students without disabilities for this same school year was 27,497.

In SY 2020-2021, the number of long-term suspensions or expulsions for students with disabilities equaled 0 students (no students) based on the IDEA 618 discipline reported data; the number of long-term suspensions or expulsions for students without disabilities was also the same (Zero students) based on the GDOE student data system. The data for this reporting period could be attributed to COVID-19.

For this reporting year and using SY 2020-2021 data described above, 0.00% of students with and without disabilities were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days. This data was impacted by COVID-19 as GDOE did not open its doors for full in-person instruction until November 29, 2021.

Based on this performance whereby no students, with and without disabilities were expelled or suspended for greater than 10 days, and using Guam's definition of "significant discrepancy," Guam Part B met the target for Indicator 4A for this FFY APR reporting period using the one-year lag data.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

Per Indicator 4A Measurement Instructions, if a "significant discrepancy" occurs, Guam must review and, if appropriate, revise its policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

For FFY 2021, Guam did not report a "significant discrepancy." Thus, for FFY 2021, Guam did not identify any noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR Section 300.170(b).

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4A - OSEP Response

## 4A - Required Actions

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

 A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

YES

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:**

Per OSEP instructions, Indicator 4B is not applicable to Guam.

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4B - OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable to Guam.

## 4B- Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;

B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and

C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

**Measurement**

 A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

 B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

 C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| A | 2020 | Target >= | 50.00% |  | 44.50% | 44.55% | 42.06% |
| A | 42.06% | Data | 45.47% | 44.21% | 44.72% | 41.27% | 42.06% |
| B | 2020 | Target <= | 10.00% |  | 3.50% | 3.45% | 3.89% |
| B | 3.89% | Data | 4.89% | 3.79% | 2.75% | 2.75% | 3.89% |
| C | 2020 | Target <= | 1.50% |  | 0.10% | 0.09% | 0.12% |
| C | 0.12% | Data | 0.06% | 0.11% | 0.17% | 0.12% | 0.12% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 43.00% | 43.50% | 44.00% | 44.50% | 45.00% |
| Target B <= | 3.75% | 3.75% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.25% |
| Target C <= | 0.10% | 0.10% | 0.09% | 0.09% | 0.05% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.

- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).

- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held to review all the Indicators for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, One session was held virtually, while the other session was a hybrid presentation, whereby stakeholders had the opportunity to attend either virtually or in-person.

- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.

- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.

- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2020-2021, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.

- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.

- Two in-person sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the Logic Model, the Theory of Action, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP. Several planning meetings and core team meetings were also held throughout the year to determine next steps for the SSIP.

Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:

April 19, 2022: At a regularly scheduled Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD) meeting, compliance Indicators 11, 12, 13, along with Indicators 15 and 16, were presented. Drill down data was also presented to discuss areas of concern for Indicators 11 and 13. Those present at the meeting included parents of children with disabilities, a Guam Education Board Member, and parents who are members of the Autism Communities Together (ACT), the Down Syndrome Society, and the Guam Parent and Training Information (PTI) Center.

April 26, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with parent members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), data for Indicators 1 and 2 were presented, which included disaggregated data for each of the high schools for students with disabilities who exited the system either through graduation or dropping out.

May 9, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with GAPSD members, Indicators 5 and 6 were presented, along with disaggregated data for each of the LRE settings, to discuss reasons for slippage for 5A and 6B. Stakeholders discussed possible reasons for the slippage and ways the programs could provide support to the teachers and students with disabilities and their families so education could be provided in more inclusive settings with typically developing peers.

August 5, 2022: During the GDOE Division of Special Education’s Orientation Session (Back to School), data and performance from the Compliance Indicators 11, 12, and 13 were shared with personnel. The purpose of the presentation was two-fold: to share performance data and to review the standards of practice and expectations for Indicators 11 and 13, whereby Division personnel play an important role in meeting the compliance targets for these Indicators.

December 5, 2022: A focus group session was held with Division personnel comprised of SPED Coaches whose task is to provide technical assistance, training and support to school personnel. Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13 and 14 were presented during this session. A discussion ensued referencing possible areas of improvement, especially for Indicators 5, 11, 13 and 14.

January 3 & 9, 2023: Focus group sessions were held with personnel from the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Program comprised of teachers and services providers. The purpose was to review data from Indicators 6, 7, and 12. The group drilled down data for Indicators 6 and 7 to determine reasons for the slippage in performance. Correlations were made between the LRE and the performance in the early childhood outcomes, most especially for Indicator 7, summary statements 2 in all three outcome areas. The group then developed plans for next steps to address the slippage for Indicators 6 and 7.

January 18 & 28, 2023: The full SPP/APR for FFY 2021 was presented to stakeholders on both these dates. January 18, 2023 was delivered virtually to members from the GAPSD, family and parents from parent groups (ACT, Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI), and members from the GEB. On January 28, 2023, the full SPP/APR was also presented both in-person and virtually to Division personnel, school teachers, members from GAPSD, along with family members and parents from ACT, the Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI, a member from the GEB, and a high school student with disabilities. These presentations included the data and updates on the SSIP. Participants appreciated the information shared on the “5 Why’s” to show possible reasons for no progress on the SSIP target for FFY 2021.

For Indicator 8: Several focus groups and planning sessions were held on February 10, 2022, March 31, 2022, and July 23, 2022. Members included GDOE Division of personnel in charge of Parent Services, consultants from the University of Guam CEDDERS, and GAPSD parent members.

For Indicator 17 – SSIP: Nine planning meetings with GDOE personnel and UOG CEDDERS were held throughout the school year to ensure the SSIP schools were implementing PDSAs, conducting aimswebPlus assessments with fidelity, providing explicit instruction in reading, and overall, following the activities outlined in the SSIP. In addition to the planning meetings, seven core team meetings were held with the SSIP Principals, the teacher leaders, parents from the SSIP schools to review the Theory of Action, Logic Model, and Evaluation Plan. Two large stakeholder group meetings were also held with all personnel, inclusive of parents, from the SSIP schools on May 19, 2022 and October 13, 2022. Additionally, a session on Reading and the Continuous Improvement Cycle was held with all SSIP schools on August 9, 2022, along with a session for the scale up schools which was held on February 16, 2022.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 1,652 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 642 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 46 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools | 0 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities | 0 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 1 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 642 | 1,652 | 42.06% | 43.00% | 38.86% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 46 | 1,652 | 3.89% | 3.75% | 2.78% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 1 | 1,652 | 0.12% | 0.10% | 0.06% | Met target | No Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | Data drill down activities were conducted with stakeholders, inclusive of members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities, case managers from the various GDOE schools, and Division personnel. The data drill down activity revealed more IEP Teams making placement decisions for students with disabilities in settings where specialized instruction was received inside the regular classroom 79% through 39% of the school day. 618 data reported through the EDFacts submission system for this reporting period revealed that 55.63% (919/1662) of students with disabilities receive their instruction in this LRE setting. This occurred more so for students in middle school and high school, whereby 29.16% (268/919) and 46.03% (423/919) were placed in this LRE setting, respectively.To target this, Guam Part B will provide more technical assistance and training to support teachers at all levels so more students with disabilities could receive their education in the regular class for 80% or more of the school day. Currently, the Division has individuals who act in the capacity as Special Education Coaches who are tasked to provide this technical assistance and guidance to school teams in all areas of the IEP Process. The SPED Coaches are currently receiving targeted technical assistance and support from the Progress Center to increase their skills in order to provide school teams the supports needed to develop sound IEPs for students with disabilities and to determine appropriate services and the LRE settings where these services are delivered. |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.

 C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

**Measurement**

 A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

 B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

 C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| **A** | Target >= | 62.00% | 64.00% | 66.00% | 66.50% | 38.64% |
| **A** | Data | 61.21% | 63.47% | 52.35% | 60.81% | 38.64% |
| **B** | Target <= | 10.00% | 10.00% | 9.00% | 8.50% | 18.18% |
| **B** | Data | 13.94% | 5.39% | 11.41% | 20.27% | 18.18% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.

- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).

- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held to review all the Indicators for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, One session was held virtually, while the other session was a hybrid presentation, whereby stakeholders had the opportunity to attend either virtually or in-person.

- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.

- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.

- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2020-2021, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.

- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.

- Two in-person sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the Logic Model, the Theory of Action, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP. Several planning meetings and core team meetings were also held throughout the year to determine next steps for the SSIP.

Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:

April 19, 2022: At a regularly scheduled Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD) meeting, compliance Indicators 11, 12, 13, along with Indicators 15 and 16, were presented. Drill down data was also presented to discuss areas of concern for Indicators 11 and 13. Those present at the meeting included parents of children with disabilities, a Guam Education Board Member, and parents who are members of the Autism Communities Together (ACT), the Down Syndrome Society, and the Guam Parent and Training Information (PTI) Center.

April 26, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with parent members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), data for Indicators 1 and 2 were presented, which included disaggregated data for each of the high schools for students with disabilities who exited the system either through graduation or dropping out.

May 9, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with GAPSD members, Indicators 5 and 6 were presented, along with disaggregated data for each of the LRE settings, to discuss reasons for slippage for 5A and 6B. Stakeholders discussed possible reasons for the slippage and ways the programs could provide support to the teachers and students with disabilities and their families so education could be provided in more inclusive settings with typically developing peers.

August 5, 2022: During the GDOE Division of Special Education’s Orientation Session (Back to School), data and performance from the Compliance Indicators 11, 12, and 13 were shared with personnel. The purpose of the presentation was two-fold: to share performance data and to review the standards of practice and expectations for Indicators 11 and 13, whereby Division personnel play an important role in meeting the compliance targets for these Indicators.

December 5, 2022: A focus group session was held with Division personnel comprised of SPED Coaches whose task is to provide technical assistance, training and support to school personnel. Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13 and 14 were presented during this session. A discussion ensued referencing possible areas of improvement, especially for Indicators 5, 11, 13 and 14.

January 3 & 9, 2023: Focus group sessions were held with personnel from the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Program comprised of teachers and services providers. The purpose was to review data from Indicators 6, 7, and 12. The group drilled down data for Indicators 6 and 7 to determine reasons for the slippage in performance. Correlations were made between the LRE and the performance in the early childhood outcomes, most especially for Indicator 7, summary statements 2 in all three outcome areas. The group then developed plans for next steps to address the slippage for Indicators 6 and 7.

January 18 & 28, 2023: The full SPP/APR for FFY 2021 was presented to stakeholders on both these dates. January 18, 2023 was delivered virtually to members from the GAPSD, family and parents from parent groups (ACT, Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI), and members from the GEB. On January 28, 2023, the full SPP/APR was also presented both in-person and virtually to Division personnel, school teachers, members from GAPSD, along with family members and parents from ACT, the Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI, a member from the GEB, and a high school student with disabilities. These presentations included the data and updates on the SSIP. Participants appreciated the information shared on the “5 Why’s” to show possible reasons for no progress on the SSIP target for FFY 2021.

For Indicator 8: Several focus groups and planning sessions were held on February 10, 2022, March 31, 2022, and July 23, 2022. Members included GDOE Division of personnel in charge of Parent Services, consultants from the University of Guam CEDDERS, and GAPSD parent members.

For Indicator 17 – SSIP: Nine planning meetings with GDOE personnel and UOG CEDDERS were held throughout the school year to ensure the SSIP schools were implementing PDSAs, conducting aimswebPlus assessments with fidelity, providing explicit instruction in reading, and overall, following the activities outlined in the SSIP. In addition to the planning meetings, seven core team meetings were held with the SSIP Principals, the teacher leaders, parents from the SSIP schools to review the Theory of Action, Logic Model, and Evaluation Plan. Two large stakeholder group meetings were also held with all personnel, inclusive of parents, from the SSIP schools on May 19, 2022 and October 13, 2022. Additionally, a session on Reading and the Continuous Improvement Cycle was held with all SSIP schools on August 9, 2022, along with a session for the scale up schools which was held on February 16, 2022.

**Targets**

**Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.**

Inclusive Targets

**Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.**

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

| **Part** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | 2020 | 38.64% |
| **B** | 2020 | 18.18% |
| **C** | 2020 | 43.18% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 39.00% | 42.00% | 45.00% | 48.00% | 51.00% |
| Target B <= | 18.00% | 17.50% | 17.00% | 16.50% | 16.00% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target C <= | 42.00% | 41.00% | 40.00% | 39.00% | 38.00% |

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/06/2022

| **Description** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **3 through 5 - Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total number of children with IEPs | 41 | 42 | 19 | 102 |
| a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 9 | 21 | 12 | 42 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 13 | 12 | 5 | 30 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| c1**.** Numberof children receiving special education and related services in the home | 19 | 9 | 2 | 30 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 42 | 102 | 38.64% | 39.00% | 41.18% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 30 | 102 | 18.18% | 18.00% | 29.41% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| C. Home | 30 | 102 | 43.18% | 42.00% | 29.41% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B aged 3 through 5, if applicable**

Guam Part B Did not meet the target for Indicator 6B with its performance of 29.41% (30/102) for preschoolers with IEPs. This is a slippage of 11.23% from what was reported for FFY 2020 at 18.18%. For Indicator 6, the Program continues to work closely to ensure “to the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are nondisabled.”

Reasons for the Slippage:
Stakeholders requested for drill down data on the following: type of disability and the child’s age for those placed in the separate special education class setting.

Age:
Of the 30 preschoolers with IEPs in a separate class, 13 or 43.3% are 3 years of age; 14 or 46.7% are 4 years of age; and 3 or 0.007% are 5 years of age.

Disability:
Of the 30 preschoolers with IEPs in a separate class, there were 18 on the autism spectrum disorder, 6 have developmental disabilities, 2 have hearing impairments, 2 have other health impairments, 1 has a speech/language impairment, and 1 is visually impaired.

Stakeholders indicated the reason for the increase in the number of preschoolers in separate classes may be attributed to the increase in number of children identified with autism who may require a smaller setting to address the behavior challenges. Furthermore, stakeholders discussed the following implementation activities to target the slippage:

1. Training for Child Care Providers and Directors: There is the need to work closely with child care directors and teachers in providing training and support on strategies to support preschoolers with disabilities in child care settings using the early childhood coaching model. In addition, the plan is to work with the Bureau of Child Care Services to provide additional support for Child Care centers that have children with disabilities by offering additional resources to ensure child care providers are given time during the day to work with ECSE Coaches.

2. Training with ECSE teachers and service providers on the Early Start Denver Model (ESDM): The ESDM is a naturalistic developmental behavior approach that employs a transdisciplinary team to address the challenges faced by young children with autism. This evidence-based model focuses on affect, attention, motivation, and arousal. The ESDM intervention strategies can be applied with adults and peers, utilizing the children’s interest and strengths. The use of EBPs embed learning opportunities in meaningful and motivated everyday routines.

3. Continue collaborative partnership with Head Start and Pre-Kindergarten teachers on using applied practices and co-teaching methodology for embedding EBPs that enhance inclusive practices for preschoolers with IEPs.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of preschool children aged 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

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

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.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:**

**Summary Statement 1**: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2**: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| A1 | 2008 | Target >= | 85.00% | 85.50% | 85.50% | 85.50% | 70.00% |
| A1 | 71.00% | Data | 76.92% | 70.18% | 83.58% | 79.31% | 91.30% |
| A2 | 2008 | Target >= | 39.00% | 57.50% | 57.51% | 57.51% | 21.28% |
| A2 | 57.50% | Data | 21.21% | 29.51% | 23.53% | 15.52% | 21.28% |
| B1 | 2008 | Target >= | 85.50% | 86.00% | 86.00% | 86.00% | 80.00% |
| B1 | 80.00% | Data | 80.00% | 75.00% | 88.24% | 75.86% | 95.74% |
| B2 | 2008 | Target >= | 34.00% | 47.50% | 47.51% | 47.51% | 6.38% |
| B2 | 47.50% | Data | 16.67% | 27.87% | 20.59% | 13.79% | 6.38% |
| C1 | 2008 | Target >= | 85.00% | 89.31% | 89.32% | 89.32% | 89.00% |
| C1 | 89.30% | Data | 75.00% | 59.65% | 80.60% | 78.95% | 91.49% |
| C2 | 2008 | Target >= | 40.00% | 70.00% | 70.01% | 70.01% | 21.28% |
| C2 | 70.00% | Data | 30.30% | 32.79% | 25.00% | 20.69% | 21.28% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1 >= | 70.40% | 70.80% | 80.00% | 80.25% | 80.50% |
| Target A2 >= | 30.00% | 35.00% | 40.00% | 45.00% | 58.00% |
| Target B1 >= | 80.40% | 80.80% | 90.20% | 90.40% | 90.80% |
| Target B2 >= | 7.00% | 10.00% | 15.00% | 20.00% | 48.00% |
| Target C1 >= | 89.50% | 90.00% | 90.50% | 91.00% | 91.50% |
| Target C2 >= | 30.00% | 40.00% | 50.00% | 60.00% | 71.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.

- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).

- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held to review all the Indicators for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, One session was held virtually, while the other session was a hybrid presentation, whereby stakeholders had the opportunity to attend either virtually or in-person.

- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.

- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.

- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2020-2021, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.

- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.

- Two in-person sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the Logic Model, the Theory of Action, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP. Several planning meetings and core team meetings were also held throughout the year to determine next steps for the SSIP.

Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:

April 19, 2022: At a regularly scheduled Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD) meeting, compliance Indicators 11, 12, 13, along with Indicators 15 and 16, were presented. Drill down data was also presented to discuss areas of concern for Indicators 11 and 13. Those present at the meeting included parents of children with disabilities, a Guam Education Board Member, and parents who are members of the Autism Communities Together (ACT), the Down Syndrome Society, and the Guam Parent and Training Information (PTI) Center.

April 26, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with parent members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), data for Indicators 1 and 2 were presented, which included disaggregated data for each of the high schools for students with disabilities who exited the system either through graduation or dropping out.

May 9, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with GAPSD members, Indicators 5 and 6 were presented, along with disaggregated data for each of the LRE settings, to discuss reasons for slippage for 5A and 6B. Stakeholders discussed possible reasons for the slippage and ways the programs could provide support to the teachers and students with disabilities and their families so education could be provided in more inclusive settings with typically developing peers.

August 5, 2022: During the GDOE Division of Special Education’s Orientation Session (Back to School), data and performance from the Compliance Indicators 11, 12, and 13 were shared with personnel. The purpose of the presentation was two-fold: to share performance data and to review the standards of practice and expectations for Indicators 11 and 13, whereby Division personnel play an important role in meeting the compliance targets for these Indicators.

December 5, 2022: A focus group session was held with Division personnel comprised of SPED Coaches whose task is to provide technical assistance, training and support to school personnel. Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13 and 14 were presented during this session. A discussion ensued referencing possible areas of improvement, especially for Indicators 5, 11, 13 and 14.

January 3 & 9, 2023: Focus group sessions were held with personnel from the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Program comprised of teachers and services providers. The purpose was to review data from Indicators 6, 7, and 12. The group drilled down data for Indicators 6 and 7 to determine reasons for the slippage in performance. Correlations were made between the LRE and the performance in the early childhood outcomes, most especially for Indicator 7, summary statements 2 in all three outcome areas. The group then developed plans for next steps to address the slippage for Indicators 6 and 7.

January 18 & 28, 2023: The full SPP/APR for FFY 2021 was presented to stakeholders on both these dates. January 18, 2023 was delivered virtually to members from the GAPSD, family and parents from parent groups (ACT, Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI), and members from the GEB. On January 28, 2023, the full SPP/APR was also presented both in-person and virtually to Division personnel, school teachers, members from GAPSD, along with family members and parents from ACT, the Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI, a member from the GEB, and a high school student with disabilities. These presentations included the data and updates on the SSIP. Participants appreciated the information shared on the “5 Why’s” to show possible reasons for no progress on the SSIP target for FFY 2021.

For Indicator 8: Several focus groups and planning sessions were held on February 10, 2022, March 31, 2022, and July 23, 2022. Members included GDOE Division of personnel in charge of Parent Services, consultants from the University of Guam CEDDERS, and GAPSD parent members.

For Indicator 17 – SSIP: Nine planning meetings with GDOE personnel and UOG CEDDERS were held throughout the school year to ensure the SSIP schools were implementing PDSAs, conducting aimswebPlus assessments with fidelity, providing explicit instruction in reading, and overall, following the activities outlined in the SSIP. In addition to the planning meetings, seven core team meetings were held with the SSIP Principals, the teacher leaders, parents from the SSIP schools to review the Theory of Action, Logic Model, and Evaluation Plan. Two large stakeholder group meetings were also held with all personnel, inclusive of parents, from the SSIP schools on May 19, 2022 and October 13, 2022. Additionally, a session on Reading and the Continuous Improvement Cycle was held with all SSIP schools on August 9, 2022, along with a session for the scale up schools which was held on February 16, 2022.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

44

**Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 3 | 6.82% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 37 | 84.09% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 4 | 9.09% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 41 | 44 | 91.30% | 70.40% | 93.18% | Met target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 4 | 44 | 21.28% | 30.00% | 9.09% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)**

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 4 | 9.09% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 37 | 84.09% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 3 | 6.82% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 40 | 44 | 95.74% | 80.40% | 90.91% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 3 | 44 | 6.38% | 7.00% | 6.82% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 4 | 9.09% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 36 | 81.82% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 4 | 9.09% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.*Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*  | 40 | 44 | 91.49% | 89.50% | 90.91% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 4 | 44 | 21.28% | 30.00% | 9.09% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A2** | 7A SS2: SlippageOf the 44 preschoolers with IEPs exiting the program, 9.09% or 4 out of 44 preschoolers were functioning within age expectations in positive social-emotional skills by the time they exited. This is a slippage in performance of 12.29% from the FFY 2020 performance of 21.28 %. Based on the data review, there were 37 preschoolers that were in category “c” who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it. Stakeholders requested for the ECSE Program to analyze the following data points of preschoolers in these categories: 1) age at entry; 2) length of early childhood special education (ECSE) services received; 3) settings; and 4) types of disabilities. Age at Entry:Twenty-six (26) out of the 37 preschoolers or 70% were 3 years of age when they first enrolled to received ECSE services; 24% (9/37) were 4 years of age; and 5% (2/37) were 5 years of age. Length of Services: Twenty-four percent (24%) or 9 out of the 37 preschoolers had 12 months or less of ECSE Services; 41% or 15 out the 37 had a range of 13 to 24 months of ECSE service; and 13 out of the 37 or 35% had greater than 25 months of ECSE service. Setting: A total of 19% (7/37) received ECSE services at home; 43% (16/37) of preschoolers were in Head Start classes; 14% (5/37) were in regular early childhood programs most of the day; and 24% (9/37) were in an early childhood special education classroom.Types of Disabilities: Of the 37 children in category “c”, 41% (15/37) are eligible as having developmental delays; 49% (18/37) have autism; 1 child has a learning disability; 1 child has a communication disorder; and 2 children have other health impairments.  |
| **C2** | 7C SS2: Slippage Of the 44 preschoolers with IEPs exiting the program, 9.09% or 4 out of 44 preschoolers were functioning within age expectations in the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs by the time they exited. This is a slippage of 12.19% from the FFY 2020 performance of 21.28%. Based on the data review, there were 36 preschoolers or 81.8% that were in category “c” who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it in the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. The stakeholders requested for the Program to analyze the following data points of preschoolers in these categories: 1) age at entry; 2) length of early childhood special education (ECSE) services received; 3) settings; and 4) types of disabilities. Age at Entry:Twenty-five (25) out of the 36 or 69% were 3 years of age when they first received ECSE services; 25% (9/36) were 4 years of age; and 6% (2/36) were 5 years of age.Length of Services: Eleven (11) out of the 36 preschoolers or 31% in category “c” had 12 months or less of ECSE Services; 39% (14/36) had a range of 13 to 24 months of ECSE service; and 31% (11/36) had greater than 25 months of service. Setting: A total of 6 or 17% preschoolers received ECSE services at home; 39% (14/36) were in Head Start classes; 17% (6/36) were in regular early childhood programs most of the day; and 28% (10/36) were in an early childhood special education classroom. Types of Disabilities: Of the 36 children in category “c”, 15 or 42% are eligible as having a developmental delay; 47% (17/36) have autism; 1 has a learning disability; 1 has a communication disorder; and 2 have other health impairments.  |

**Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)**

YES

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used?  | NO |

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

Guam Part B Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Program uses multiple sources of information to determine the status of early childhood outcomes. Most of the information needed is collected as part of the development of the child's Individualized Education Program (IEP); therefore, collecting child assessment information is part of the IEP development process and not an added step.

The following information is considered in determining a child's status relating to the three early childhood outcomes:

The summary information for child outcomes is expected to take into account the child's functioning across a full range of situations and settings. Information from many individuals in contact with the child is considered in deciding the rating for each outcome. These may include, but not be limited to the following: Parents, ECSE Teachers or Head Start Teachers, Child Care Providers (if appropriate), and other Early Childhood Providers (if appropriate).

Many types of information are used in determining the child's status relative to the child outcomes. These may include, but not be limited to: Parent input and observations; Service Provider input and observations; curriculum based assessments such as the Teaching Strategies Gold Creative Curriculum or the Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP); the Guam Early Learning Guidelines; and the child's progress reports from Service Providers.

Information about each outcome is reflected in the child's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance across typical settings and situations that make up the child's daily routines.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Next Steps to address the Slippage:

On January 3 &9, 2023, the University of Guam CEDDERS facilitated the professional development sessions for Early Childhood Special Education teachers. During these sessions, CEDDERS presented the results of this indicator, gathered input on possible reasons for the slippage, reviewed improvement activities, and provided recommendations that would result in improved outcomes. The stakeholders discussed the key practices for embedding the child outcomes summary (COS) process and are working through a case study applied practice activity using the (COS) key practices. As a result of the discussion, the stakeholders agreed that the applied practice case review will ensure consistency of embedding the COS practices in the IEP process.

Based on the stakeholder discussion, the average length of time that preschoolers are enrolled in ECSE services is about 19 months, indicating that preschoolers with disabilities are not accessing ECSE service early on. The stakeholders shared this may be attributed to the concerns or fears families are still experiencing due to the COVID-19 pandemic. For the past 2 years, preschoolers may have had little, to no interactions with peers due to their parent’s fears of their children getting sick. In Fall 2022, the ECSE services began providing in-person services and will continue to provide virtual ECSE services in home settings as an option for families to choose from or a combination of some virtual and some in-person visits.

The following are recommended activities targeted to increase early childhood outcomes:
- Continue training on embedding the COS key practices in the IEP process to ensure progress monitoring of skills identified in the child’s present level of academic performance and functional skills. Alignment with the COS process will ensure that the preschooler’s needs and goals remain at the forefront and progress monitoring occurs at every IEP meeting.

- Continue to increase the amount of time preschoolers with IEPs are actively participating alongside typical peers. Frequency and consistency of service provision is key to continued progress.

- Continue to provide training for parents on evidence-based practices in enhancing their child’s overall development through participation in community outreach activities such as the Village Play Time and Story Hour and Parent Café events open to young children with and without disabilities.

Stakeholders additionally shared the need to expand training for all ECSE teachers on the Early Start Denver Model (ESDM) with the increasing number of preschoolers identified with autism.

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8: Parent involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of parents from whom response is requested****is allowed.* *When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023,** include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 8 - Indicator Data

| **Question** | **Yes / No**  |
| --- | --- |
| Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?  | NO |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.

- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).

- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held to review all the Indicators for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, One session was held virtually, while the other session was a hybrid presentation, whereby stakeholders had the opportunity to attend either virtually or in-person.

- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.

- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.

- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2020-2021, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.

- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.

- Two in-person sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the Logic Model, the Theory of Action, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP. Several planning meetings and core team meetings were also held throughout the year to determine next steps for the SSIP.

Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:

April 19, 2022: At a regularly scheduled Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD) meeting, compliance Indicators 11, 12, 13, along with Indicators 15 and 16, were presented. Drill down data was also presented to discuss areas of concern for Indicators 11 and 13. Those present at the meeting included parents of children with disabilities, a Guam Education Board Member, and parents who are members of the Autism Communities Together (ACT), the Down Syndrome Society, and the Guam Parent and Training Information (PTI) Center.

April 26, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with parent members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), data for Indicators 1 and 2 were presented, which included disaggregated data for each of the high schools for students with disabilities who exited the system either through graduation or dropping out.

May 9, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with GAPSD members, Indicators 5 and 6 were presented, along with disaggregated data for each of the LRE settings, to discuss reasons for slippage for 5A and 6B. Stakeholders discussed possible reasons for the slippage and ways the programs could provide support to the teachers and students with disabilities and their families so education could be provided in more inclusive settings with typically developing peers.

August 5, 2022: During the GDOE Division of Special Education’s Orientation Session (Back to School), data and performance from the Compliance Indicators 11, 12, and 13 were shared with personnel. The purpose of the presentation was two-fold: to share performance data and to review the standards of practice and expectations for Indicators 11 and 13, whereby Division personnel play an important role in meeting the compliance targets for these Indicators.

December 5, 2022: A focus group session was held with Division personnel comprised of SPED Coaches whose task is to provide technical assistance, training and support to school personnel. Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13 and 14 were presented during this session. A discussion ensued referencing possible areas of improvement, especially for Indicators 5, 11, 13 and 14.

January 3 & 9, 2023: Focus group sessions were held with personnel from the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Program comprised of teachers and services providers. The purpose was to review data from Indicators 6, 7, and 12. The group drilled down data for Indicators 6 and 7 to determine reasons for the slippage in performance. Correlations were made between the LRE and the performance in the early childhood outcomes, most especially for Indicator 7, summary statements 2 in all three outcome areas. The group then developed plans for next steps to address the slippage for Indicators 6 and 7.

January 18 & 28, 2023: The full SPP/APR for FFY 2021 was presented to stakeholders on both these dates. January 18, 2023 was delivered virtually to members from the GAPSD, family and parents from parent groups (ACT, Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI), and members from the GEB. On January 28, 2023, the full SPP/APR was also presented both in-person and virtually to Division personnel, school teachers, members from GAPSD, along with family members and parents from ACT, the Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI, a member from the GEB, and a high school student with disabilities. These presentations included the data and updates on the SSIP. Participants appreciated the information shared on the “5 Why’s” to show possible reasons for no progress on the SSIP target for FFY 2021.

For Indicator 8: Several focus groups and planning sessions were held on February 10, 2022, March 31, 2022, and July 23, 2022. Members included GDOE Division of personnel in charge of Parent Services, consultants from the University of Guam CEDDERS, and GAPSD parent members.

For Indicator 17 – SSIP: Nine planning meetings with GDOE personnel and UOG CEDDERS were held throughout the school year to ensure the SSIP schools were implementing PDSAs, conducting aimswebPlus assessments with fidelity, providing explicit instruction in reading, and overall, following the activities outlined in the SSIP. In addition to the planning meetings, seven core team meetings were held with the SSIP Principals, the teacher leaders, parents from the SSIP schools to review the Theory of Action, Logic Model, and Evaluation Plan. Two large stakeholder group meetings were also held with all personnel, inclusive of parents, from the SSIP schools on May 19, 2022 and October 13, 2022. Additionally, a session on Reading and the Continuous Improvement Cycle was held with all SSIP schools on August 9, 2022, along with a session for the scale up schools which was held on February 16, 2022.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 62.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= | 80.00% | 84.00% | 86.00% | 86.50% | 72.00% |
| Data | 92.74% | 71.37% | 72.88% |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 72.00% | 75.00% | 78.00% | 81.00% | 84.00% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities** | **Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 167 | 235 |  | 72.00% | 71.06% | Did not meet target | N/A |

**Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.**

The same process for dissemination and collection was conducted for parents of preschool children with IEPs, as with the school age group. The survey was distributed using a census process where the survey was distributed to every parent with a child receiving special education services. However, if a parent had more than one child in a specific level (Elementary, Middle, or High School), only one survey was disseminated to the parent. If a parent also had a child in either Middle or High School, the parent also received a survey for the child at that level.

A listing of all Active (A) and Waiting (W) students by school was obtained in March 2022. This list includes preschoolers with IEPs in their respective school or district school. All preschoolers with IEPs are assigned to an elementary school within their district of enrollment. The first dissemination involved sending home the IDEA Part B Parent Survey along with a cover letter from the school principal. The surveys were delivered to the parent through his or her child starting in the first week of April 2022. The second dissemination was during the second week of May for non-respondents of the first dissemination.

Each parent was provided the following options to return the completed survey: return by mail; return to the school principal; return to the Division of Special Education, Parent Services Office; or email to Guam CEDDERS Survey Consultant.

Parents were also provided the opportunity to complete the survey on-line. Of the 241 surveys received, 9.54% (23/241) were completed online. Indicator 8 response rate of 14.04% (235/1674) however was based on the valid responses for the Indicator 8 measure.

Additionally, another opportunity to complete the survey was provided to parents who attended the Autism Community Together (ACT) quarterly meeting in July 2022. The ACT is a parent support organization that also serves as the Guam Parent Training and Information (PTI) program under the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH). LDAH administers the Pacific Islands Partnership PTI program, an OSEP-funded grant, that supports parents and families of children with disabilities throughout the Pacific Basin region.

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

1,674

**Percentage of respondent parents**

14.04%

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Response Rate  |  | 14.04% |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

After reviewing the data and response rate for Indicator 8, stakeholders agreed that additional measures need to be taken to increase the number of parents and guardians responding to the survey. Year after year, surveys have been mailed out without much success. Stakeholders proposed the idea of conducting either a phone survey or online survey within one week after an IEP meeting is held. Stakeholders likened this to a “how did we do?” satisfaction survey given to individuals after a service has been provided. Continued measures will be taken to update demographic information such as contact numbers and email addresses to ensure a means of connecting with parents or other family members.

Guam Part B will continue to collaborate with the ACT organization that serves as the Guam PTI program to engage families in responding to the survey. The Guam PTI program activities are opportunities to meet with families to gather information on how best to hear from parents about parental involvement. Additionally, Guam Part B received an OSEP-funded State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG): Project Hita Para Mo’na that utilizes the Leading by Convening framework for engaging families and providers in improving the professional and family learning opportunities for increasing literacy skills of children with disabilities. The SPDG activities facilitate increasing parent engagement, which will serve as a means for increased parental involvement and responses to the survey.

**Describe the analysis** **of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.**

Guam Part B analyzed the response rate to determine whether the response represented a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities and whether there was any indication of nonresponse bias. The analysis included a review of the school-level and village of residence of the parents who completed the survey compared to the parents who did not complete the survey. With Guam Part B reporting a low return rate, the review of the location demographics would assist in determining whether the demographics of those who completed the survey are different from those who did not.

For school-level, respondents were from 22 of the 26 elementary schools, representing 84.62% (22/26) of elementary schools. For middle schools, respondents came from the eight (8) middle schools. There were no surveys received from the two charter schools that had middle-school aged students enrolled in their schools. The middle school representation was therefore 80% (8/10) of schools that included middle-school aged students. Respondents for the high school came from five of the six high schools with no respondents from the two charter schools with high school-aged students, representing 62.50% (5/8) of schools with high school-aged students.

The location of the elementary schools that did not have any respondents included a distribution of northern, central, and southern schools. For the middle and high school levels, the nonrespondents were primarily from the charter schools and one public high school.

For the village of residence demographic, 94.74% (18/19) of the villages included respondents. The one village that didn’t have a survey respondent was a central village, which represented 0.7% of the children with IEPs served. It should be noted that this central village is typically not one of the village of residence for the schools that did not have any responses to the survey. Most of the respondents were from the two largest villages, with a range of respondent representation of 0.4% for the smaller villages to 25% for the large village.

Overall, the school-level and village of residence data indicated that the majority of these locations were represented by the respondents, with no indication of nonresponse bias. Guam Part B’s next steps to continue to ensure a broad cross section of respondent parents include working closely with ACT, the Guam PTI program, and their SPDG: Project Hita Para Mo’na to increase awareness about the parental involvement survey.

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.** **States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

Guam Part B reports that the demographics of parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Guam Part B utilized the demographics of race/ethnicity and geographic location to determine representativeness using the +/-3% metric calculation.

The race/ethnicity categories in the survey mirrored that of the GDOE race/ethnicity categories within its database. Guam Part B utilized the OSEP ethnicity categories reported annually to assess ethnicity representation. The analysis reviewed the ethnicity responses in comparison to the Child Count ethnicity data of children with IEPs at the time the surveys were distributed. Based on the metric used, the Asian, Other Pacific Islanders, and Two or More ethnicity categories exceeded the +/-3% difference, while the other ethnicity categories were within the +/-3% difference. The Asian ethnicity was considered over-represented with a 5% difference between the two groups – respondents and Child Count. The Other Pacific Islander ethnicity category, which represents the majority of our island community, was considered under-represented with a -24% difference. The Two or More ethnicity category was over-represented with a 20% difference. It should be noted that the data for the respondent group is based on the respondent’s selection of their child’s ethnicity at the time of completing the survey.

Upon further review of the demographics of the parents and guardians who responded to the survey, stakeholders agreed to look at the data representing the village or geographic location of the parents and guardians of children with disabilities. As reported in the previous section, most of the respondents were from the two largest villages, with a range of respondent representation of 0.4% for the smaller villages to 25% for a large village. The respondents were from 18 of the 19 villages. Based on the metric used, the two largest villages exceeded the +/-3% difference between the two groups – respondents and Child Count. The village of Dededo was under-represented at -8%, while the village of Yigo was over-represented at +5%. The difference for the other villages, including the one that did not have a respondent, were within the +/-3% difference.

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

NO

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics**

For FFY 2021, Guam Part B's response rate for Indicator 8 was 14.04% (235/1674). Although 241 surveys were received, 235 of the surveys had valid responses for the Indicator 8 measure.

Stakeholders agreed that additional measures need to be taken to increase the number of parents and guardians responding to the survey. Year after year, surveys have been mailed out without much success. Stakeholders proposed the idea of conducting either a phone survey or online survey within one week after an IEP meeting is held. Stakeholders likened this to a “how did we do?” survey given to individuals after a service has been provided. Continued measures will be taken to update demographic information such as contact numbers and email addresses to ensure a means of connecting with parents or other family members.

Guam Part B will continue to collaborate with the ACT organization that serves as the Guam PTI program to engage families in responding to the survey. The Guam PTI program activities are opportunities to meet with families to gather information on how best to hear from parents about parental involvement. Additionally, Guam Part B received an OSEP-funded State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG): Project Hita Para Mo’na that utilizes the Leading by Convening framework for engaging families and providers in improving the professional and family learning opportunities for increasing literacy skills of children with disabilities . The SPDG activities facilitate increasing parent engagement, which will serve as a means for increased parental involvement and responses to the survey.

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

Guam Part B used the +/-3% discrepancy method to determine representativeness when comparing responders to the target population (children with IEPs at the time of survey dissemination). Positive differences that exceed 3% indicate over-representativeness, while negative differences that exceed -3% indicate under-representativeness.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used?  | NO |

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used?  | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |
| If yes, provide a copy of the survey. |  |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Guam did not provide data for FFY 2020. Guam must provide the required data for FFY 2021 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, Guam must report whether its FFY 2021 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions Guam is taking to address this issue. Guam must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR Guam must report the metric used to determine representativeness, as required by the Measurement Table.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

For FFY 2021, Guam provided the required data for Indicator 8. Guam also reported on whether its data from the response group are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education and the actions Guam took to address the issue if the data was not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Guam also reported the metric used to determine representativeness, as required by the Measurement Table.

This information could be found in the section labeled: 8 Indicator Data.

## 8 - OSEP Response

## 8 - Required Actions

# Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

YES

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.**

Per OSEP instructions, Indicator 9 is not applicable to Guam.

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable to Guam.

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

YES

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below**

Per OSEP instructions, Indicator 10 is not applicable to Guam.

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable to Guam.

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: Child Find

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Compliance indicator**: 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations.

**Measurement**

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child’s previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 44.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 93.49% | 93.42% | 96.58% | 84.98% | 77.73% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received** | **(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 308 | 258 | 77.73% | 100% | 83.77% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)**

50

**Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.**

Of the 308 parental consents received, 258 were evaluated within the 60-Day time-line. There are 50 children to report in the “Account For” category described in the table below:
- 25 students were evaluated within 1-30 days after the 60-Day timeline; the reasons for delay are attributed to program delays.
- 7 students were evaluated within 31-60 days after the 60-Day timeline; the reasons for delay are attributed to program delays.
- 18 students were evaluated within 60+ days after the 60-Day timeline; the reasons for delay are attributed to program delays.

The eligibility meetings have been conducted for all 50 students; all 50 students were made eligible and are receiving special education and related services.

This information was confirmed through a report generated by the Division's Data Office as of January 30, 2023.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

The procedure that describes the identification, evaluation, and eligibility process are outlined in the Handbook for the Delivery of Special Education Services. These procedures guide the IEP Coordinators (IEPCs) and Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs) who are responsible for obtaining the necessary documents and initiating the referral process. Guam DOE follows the IDEA 2004 regulation for the 60-Day Timeline requirement. Guam has determined that the definition of "receipt of parental consent" is the date when the IEPC or CRT receives the signed parent consent form; this "receipt of parental consent" is what initiates the 60-Day Timeline.

The signed parental consent, a referral form, and all other documents supporting the need for an evaluation(s) are submitted to the Special Education Data Office where data is entered into the database. The Data Office disseminates the referral, which is inclusive of the parental consent to the support staff and evaluators of the areas specified on the referral. Guam defines "evaluation completed" as all assessments completed and documented through written reports. Upon completion of the evaluation(s), an eligibility meeting is held.

Standard Operating Procedures were also developed to ensure the completion of the evaluation within the 60-Day Timeline. Upon data entry, a report is generated by the Data Office that includes the following information: Student Name and Unique Identifier Number, school, grade, referral or evaluation area(s), permission received date, the 60-Day Timeline date, assessment completion date, and eligibility determination, to include eligibility determination date. The report is issued to the Program Coordinators for their review at the beginning of every week. Each Program Coordinator tracks the completion of the evaluations in their designated Units. This weekly monitoring process ensures that all Units are kept abreast of any referrals that may have been missed or not submitted to the respective evaluator in a timely manner.

If a student is not evaluated within a 60-Day allotted time frame, the referral is placed on a "Priority Status" and is aggressively monitored until the assessment has been completed. Reasons for delay of the evaluation are documented by the assigned evaluator on the Reasons for Delay Form and submitted to the Data Office for documentation purposes. The weekly report generated by the SPED Data Office is used in conjunction with the monthly Indicator 11: 60-Day Timeline Report to assist with the verification and validation of data that is submitted and entered into the database.

The Division has assigned an individual to aggressively monitor the completion of initial referrals. This individual is known as the "Indicator 11 Monitor." The use of this designated individual is an additional strategy the Division is employing to increase compliance with Indicator 11 requirements.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 |  |  | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2013 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2013**

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020:

In FFY 2020, Indicator 11 performance was 77.73% (164/211) compliance with the 60-day initial evaluation timeline. As described in the FFY 2020 APR, by the end of the reporting year, there were 47 initial evaluations that were completed over the 60-day timeline. In the FFY 2020 APR Indicator 11 Indicator Data section, Guam reported that all 47 initial evaluations were completed over timeline. These individual noncompliance were part of the subsequent data for the findings of noncompliance issued to the Division of Special Education in FFY 2013. Therefore, a written notice of noncompliance findings was not issued for the FFY 2020 Indicator 11 noncompliance data.

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected:

The three FFY 2013 findings of noncompliance transferred from the school to the Division of Special Education remained in FFY 2021 for not being able to demonstrate correct implementation of the 60-day timeline requirement for subsequent data.

GDOE’s Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) continued to verify correction of noncompliance through a quarterly review of the Indicator 11 data reports of subsequent data.

In November 2021, CMO reported that the three findings of noncompliance remained “not yet verified as corrected” because the Division was unable to demonstrate correct implementation of the Child Find compliance requirements for subsequent initial evaluations. The CMO described that subsequent data for initial evaluations in the FFY 2020 reporting period through November 3, 2021 continued to report noncompliance with the initial evaluation timeline requirement.

In March 2022, the CMO issued a follow-up notice to the Division indicating the Division continued to report noncompliance with the initial evaluation timeline requirement for subsequent data. The CMO’s notice described that there were 17 initial evaluations over the 60-day timeline, which represented an improvement from the November 2021 “not yet verified as corrected” notification.

Actions Taken to Address Noncompliance:

The Division of Special Education has taken the following actions to address Indicator 11 noncompliance:

(1) A majority of the delays in evaluations stemmed from the following referral areas: psycho-educational evaluations, OT, Speech, Autism and Emotional Disabilities. There is a shortage of qualified personnel within the Division to conduct the assessments in these areas. To address this qualified personnel shortage, the Division continues to prioritize personnel training to increase cross-discipline capacity and the procurement of tele-assessment services to complete required assessments:
a. Psycho-educational evaluations: Training has been initiated for academic evaluators to administer other assessments to support the administration of psycho-educational evaluations.
b. OT: Guam Part B continues to contract with an online vendor for OT evaluations and services. Currently, the Guam Part B does not have an OT and local OT vendors have not been available to support the OT evaluations.
c. Speech: In addition to having local speech language pathologists and therapists, Guam Part B continues to contract with an online vendor to support the needed speech evaluations and services.
d. Autism: An interdisciplinary approach to administering appropriate assessments for identifying children with autism continues with training for various personnel within the Division, including special education coaches, psycho-educational evaluators, speech pathologists, and social workers, to administer, score, and interpret the Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule, 2nd Edition (ADOS-2).
e. Emotional Disabilities: Cross-training continues to increase the number of personnel with expertise in emotional disabilities.

(2) The impact of COVID-19 continued during the 2020-2021 reporting period. GDOE operated three modes of learning: hard-copy curriculum, online learning, and face-to-face (FTF) instruction, which also impacted the timely completion of initial evaluations. To address the different options for learning, the Division procured Q-Global licenses for psycho-educational evaluators to conduct online assessments and shifted the ADOS-2 training to the Brief Observation of Symptoms of Autism (BOSA) training to conduct tele-assessments for identifying children with autism.

Beginning November 29, 2021, GDOE opened its doors to 5 days a week of instruction, both FTF and online, which continued to impact the completion of initial evaluations, especially with administering both in-person and tele-assessments. Beginning school year 2022-2023, GDOE operated 5 days of in-person instruction, which has increased the number of in-person assessments since the students are required to be physically in school.

(3) The Division continues to designate a program coordinator to track “Indicator 11” completion of initial evaluations on a weekly basis. Beginning school year 2022-2023, this person’s duties include providing weekly status reports to each program lead of pending evaluations under their supervision. The reports include the required timeline from receipt of consent to evaluate to the deadline to meet the 60-day timeline. The program leads are required to respond with an update to the status of each pending evaluation. In addition, the Indicator 11 status reports are reviewed by the Division leadership team on a monthly basis to determine additional actions needed to meet the Indicator 11 timeline requirements.

(4) Beginning school year 2022-2023, the Division developed the role of special education coaches designed to provide technical assistance to the schools. Training continues to focus on supporting the referral process and service provisions in the schools.

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Guam must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining three findings identified in FFY 2019 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified 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 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, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the Guam must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

As described in the Data Section of Indicator 11, Guam Part B reports the three findings identified in FFY 2013 have not been verified as corrected because the Division was unable to demonstrate correct implementation of the Child Find compliance requirements for subsequent initial evaluations. As reported in FFY 2013, the Division demonstrated correction of each individual case of noncompliance identified but has not demonstrated 100% compliance based on a review of updated or subsequent data, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

GDOE Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) is responsible for monitoring and verifying correct implementation of the Indicator 11 regulatory requirements. CMO reviews the Division data reports on a quarterly basis and provides written notification of the status of the Division’s correction of noncompliance.

## 11 - OSEP Response

Guam did not demonstrate that it corrected the three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Guam did not report that it 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.

## 11 - Required Actions

Because Guam reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, Guam must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining 3 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that, for each finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each remaining finding identified in FFY 2013, Guam: (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, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, Guam must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

 a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.

 b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.

 c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

 d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.

 e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

 f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 90.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.  | 56 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.  | 8 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.  | 44 |
| d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.  | 4 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.  | 0 |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. |  |

| **Measure** | **Numerator (c)** | **Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. | 44 | 44 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f**

0

**Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.**

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

Guam Part B receives an LEA Notification which initiates a referral from Part C to Part B for children who may be in need of continued services from Part B. This LEA Notification is submitted to Part B as early as 9 months before the child's 3rd birthday, and no later than 33 months of age. After participating in the child's Transition Conference, which is facilitated by Part C personnel, the Preschool IEP Coordinator (IEPC) is responsible for submitting the referral with the consent from the parent for an evaluation, and also monitoring the time frame for completing the evaluations within 60 days from parent consent to determining eligibility and developing and implementing an IEP by the child's 3rd birthday. The IEPC also meets monthly with the Part B Program Coordinator for the Three through 5 Program to review each pending referral.

Additionally, Guam Part C provides a monthly report on all LEA Notifications sent to Part B. The Part B data system keeps track of all the LEA Notifications submitted and provides the Three through 5 Program Coordinator a monthly report that includes a calculated percentage using OSEP's measurement for Indicator 12, of those 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 3rd birthday.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Reporting period 7/1/2021 to 6/30/2022:

There were 56 children served in Part C who were referred to Part B for eligibility. Of these 56 children: 8 were determined not eligible before their 3rd birthday; and 44 were found eligible and had their IEPs developed and implemented by their 3rd birthday.

Additionally, the following is reported:
-There were four (4) children to report in Measurement “D,” which is the number of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent which caused delays in evaluation or initial services. Of the four children:
-One family moved off-island
-Two families refused services
-One family initially refused services, but then changed their minds. The IEP for this child was eventually developed for this child, but after the 3rd birthday.
-There are no (0) children to report in Measurement “E,” the number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthday; and
-There are no (0) children to report in the ‘Account For’ category.

Furthermore, Guam Part B does not have a State policy or option whereby parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday.

Based on cumulative data for reporting period July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2022 Guam Part B has met the 100% compliance target for Indicator 12. It should be noted that Guam Part B has met this compliance indicator from FFY 2008 through FFY 2021. The Part B Program Coordinator will continue to monitor and implement the Improvement Activities developed for this Indicator.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - Required Actions

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: 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 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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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 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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 99.84% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 90.77% | 85.21% | 97.32% | 83.40% | 91.12% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition** | **Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 456 | 481 | 91.12% | 100% | 94.80% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

To calculate Indicator 13 performance, Guam Part B uses data from the special education data system for the entire reporting period. The Division of Special Education Data Office inputs the student IEP data into the special education data system based on the submitted data sheets and IEP documents from the schools. The data sheets includes verification that the IEP meets the secondary transition requirements for youth with disabilities aged 16 and older. As IEP meetings are held during the school year, the data sheets and IEPs are submitted to the Division Data Office for input into the special education data system. The special education data system is updated with each students' current information and status. At the end of the reporting period, Guam Part B verifies current Indicator 13 data for those youth with IEPs for the entire reporting period.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?  | NO |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The GDOE Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) did not issue any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020. The FFY 2020 APR Indicator 13 performance data of 91.12% (462/507), inclusive of the 45 individual noncompliance, were subsequent data reviewed for the correction of findings of noncompliance issued to the six high schools in March 2020 and June 2020 in FFY 2019. In addition, the FFY 2020 APR Indicator performance data included subsequent data for verifying subsequent correction of noncompliance for the one high school with noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2018.

As reported in the FFY 2020 APR Indicator 13 verified correction of noncompliance description, the 44 FFY 2019 findings issued to the six high schools were verified corrected in FFY 2020 and FFY 2021, which is the reason for CMO not issuing any new Indicator 13 findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020. Of the six high schools, one demonstrated verified timely correction in FFY 2020, within the one-year timeframe from its FFY 2019 written finding of noncompliance. The remaining five high schools that were issued FFY 2019 written findings of noncompliance demonstrated verified subsequent correction in FFY 2021. The breakdown of the 44 individual instances of noncompliance in the written notification of noncompliance issued to the six high schools in FFY 2019 reported in the Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019 section of Guam’s FFY 2020 APR Indicator 13, as follows:

Verified Timely Correction: In March 2021, the CMO issued a verified timely correction of noncompliance notice to one high school identified as having a total of one Indicator 13 secondary transition noncompliance in FFY 2019. The notice indicated that the one high school was able to meet the secondary transition compliance requirement, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, within the one-year timeframe from the March 2020 written notification of finding of noncompliance. The CMO verified correction through a review of school data reports. The school data reports showed that the individual instance of noncompliance was corrected, and subsequent data (additional IEPs) met the Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements at 100% compliance. This high school therefore demonstrated that it was correctly implementing Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements in the FFY 2020 reporting period. In addition, the CMO verified through a review of school data reports that this one high school did not have any Indicator 13 noncompliance from the March 2021 verified correction notice through the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period.

Verified Subsequent Correction: In August 2021 and January 2022, the CMO issued verified subsequent correction of noncompliance notices to the remaining five high schools identified as having a total of 43 Indicator 13 secondary transition noncompliance in FFY 2019: High School (HS) #1= 19 findings, HS #2 = 18 findings, and HS #3, #4, and #5 = Two findings each. The notices indicated that the five high schools were able to meet the secondary transition compliance requirement, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, beyond the one-year timeframe from June 2020. The CMO verified correction through a review of school data reports. The school data reports showed that the individual instances of noncompliance were corrected, and subsequent data (additional IEPs) met Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements at 100% compliance. These five high schools therefore demonstrated that they were correctly implementing Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements in the FFY 2021 reporting period.

In FFY 2020, these five high schools were still in the correction period for demonstrating 100% compliance with additional data, which is why CMO did not identify any new findings for the noncompliance data reported in FFY 2020 APR Indicator 13.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 |  |  | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2018 | 27 | 0 | 27 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2018**

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

In FFY 2018, the GDOE Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) issued a written notification of noncompliance findings to one high school for not meeting Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements. A total of 27 individual instances of noncompliance was identified in the written notification of noncompliance issued to the one high school.

In the June 2020 “failure to correct” memorandum, the CMO acknowledged the correction of the 27 individual instances of noncompliance, which were the findings of noncompliance issued to the high school in FFY 2018. The CMO verified that the 27 individual instances were corrected through a review of the school data report.

In December 2021, the CMO verified subsequent correction of noncompliance through a review of the school data report. The December 2021 verification memorandum indicated that the high school did not meet the verified correction of the noncompliance requirement based on the subsequent data reviewed not meeting 100% compliance.

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected:

In March 2022, the CMO issued another “failure to correct” memorandum to the high school. As a result, actions taken to correct the noncompliance included:
• GDOE initiating progressive sanctions against the high school principal. The sanctions required the school to provide weekly updates on the status of all IEPs requiring the Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements;
• CMO reviewing the school data reports on a quarterly basis and providing written notification of the status of the school’s correction of noncompliance;
• Beginning school year 2022-2023, the high school principal reassigned the supervision of the school’s special education services to another vice principal and hired an additional consulting resource teacher or case manager to support the development and review of the IEPs; and
• Beginning school year 2022-2023, the Division assigned a special education coach to provide technical support in the school’s weekly reviews of IEPs for the required secondary transition requirements.

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Guam must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining 43 findings identified in FFY 2019 and 27 findings identified in FFY 2018 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified 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 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, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, Guam must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

As described in the "Additional Information" section of Indicator 13 Data Section, Guam Part B described the verified timely and subsequent correction of noncompliance for the FFY 2019 findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. This includes the remaining 43 findings identified in FFY 2019 that were verified subsequent correction. In addition, the "Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected" section of Indicator 13 Data Section includes an explanation of the 27 FFY 2018 findings issued to one high school that continues to remain not corrected as the subsequent data did not demonstrate 100% compliance for Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements.

## 13 - OSEP Response

Guam did not demonstrate that it corrected the 27 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Guam did not report that it 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.

## 13 - Required Actions

Because Guam reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, Guam must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining 27 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that, for each finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each remaining finding identified in FFY 2018, Guam: (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, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, Guam must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

 A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

 B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school****is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

**I. *Definitions***

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

**II. *Data Reporting***

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

 1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;

 2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);

3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);

4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators***

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| A | 2009 | Target >= | 19.00% | 20.00% | 21.00% | 21.00% | 10.53% |
| A | 11.00% | Data | 4.60% | 23.19% | 16.67% | 14.77% | 10.53% |
| B | 2009 | Target >= | 62.00% | 63.00% | 64.00% | 64.00% | 52.63% |
| B | 51.00% | Data | 49.43% | 66.67% | 62.75% | 64.77% | 52.63% |
| C | 2009 | Target >= | 69.00% | 70.00% | 71.00% | 71.00% | 53.95% |
| C | 60.00% | Data | 55.17% | 68.12% | 72.55% | 65.91% | 53.95% |

**FFY 2020 Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 11.00% | 11.50% | 12.00% | 12.50% | 13.00% |
| Target B >= | 54.00% | 55.00% | 56.00% | 57.00% | 58.00% |
| Target C >= | 55.00% | 56.00% | 58.00% | 60.00% | 62.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.

- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).

- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held to review all the Indicators for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, One session was held virtually, while the other session was a hybrid presentation, whereby stakeholders had the opportunity to attend either virtually or in-person.

- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.

- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.

- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2020-2021, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.

- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.

- Two in-person sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the Logic Model, the Theory of Action, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP. Several planning meetings and core team meetings were also held throughout the year to determine next steps for the SSIP.

Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:

April 19, 2022: At a regularly scheduled Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD) meeting, compliance Indicators 11, 12, 13, along with Indicators 15 and 16, were presented. Drill down data was also presented to discuss areas of concern for Indicators 11 and 13. Those present at the meeting included parents of children with disabilities, a Guam Education Board Member, and parents who are members of the Autism Communities Together (ACT), the Down Syndrome Society, and the Guam Parent and Training Information (PTI) Center.

April 26, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with parent members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), data for Indicators 1 and 2 were presented, which included disaggregated data for each of the high schools for students with disabilities who exited the system either through graduation or dropping out.

May 9, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with GAPSD members, Indicators 5 and 6 were presented, along with disaggregated data for each of the LRE settings, to discuss reasons for slippage for 5A and 6B. Stakeholders discussed possible reasons for the slippage and ways the programs could provide support to the teachers and students with disabilities and their families so education could be provided in more inclusive settings with typically developing peers.

August 5, 2022: During the GDOE Division of Special Education’s Orientation Session (Back to School), data and performance from the Compliance Indicators 11, 12, and 13 were shared with personnel. The purpose of the presentation was two-fold: to share performance data and to review the standards of practice and expectations for Indicators 11 and 13, whereby Division personnel play an important role in meeting the compliance targets for these Indicators.

December 5, 2022: A focus group session was held with Division personnel comprised of SPED Coaches whose task is to provide technical assistance, training and support to school personnel. Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13 and 14 were presented during this session. A discussion ensued referencing possible areas of improvement, especially for Indicators 5, 11, 13 and 14.

January 3 & 9, 2023: Focus group sessions were held with personnel from the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Program comprised of teachers and services providers. The purpose was to review data from Indicators 6, 7, and 12. The group drilled down data for Indicators 6 and 7 to determine reasons for the slippage in performance. Correlations were made between the LRE and the performance in the early childhood outcomes, most especially for Indicator 7, summary statements 2 in all three outcome areas. The group then developed plans for next steps to address the slippage for Indicators 6 and 7.

January 18 & 28, 2023: The full SPP/APR for FFY 2021 was presented to stakeholders on both these dates. January 18, 2023 was delivered virtually to members from the GAPSD, family and parents from parent groups (ACT, Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI), and members from the GEB. On January 28, 2023, the full SPP/APR was also presented both in-person and virtually to Division personnel, school teachers, members from GAPSD, along with family members and parents from ACT, the Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI, a member from the GEB, and a high school student with disabilities. These presentations included the data and updates on the SSIP. Participants appreciated the information shared on the “5 Why’s” to show possible reasons for no progress on the SSIP target for FFY 2021.

For Indicator 8: Several focus groups and planning sessions were held on February 10, 2022, March 31, 2022, and July 23, 2022. Members included GDOE Division of personnel in charge of Parent Services, consultants from the University of Guam CEDDERS, and GAPSD parent members.

For Indicator 17 – SSIP: Nine planning meetings with GDOE personnel and UOG CEDDERS were held throughout the school year to ensure the SSIP schools were implementing PDSAs, conducting aimswebPlus assessments with fidelity, providing explicit instruction in reading, and overall, following the activities outlined in the SSIP. In addition to the planning meetings, seven core team meetings were held with the SSIP Principals, the teacher leaders, parents from the SSIP schools to review the Theory of Action, Logic Model, and Evaluation Plan. Two large stakeholder group meetings were also held with all personnel, inclusive of parents, from the SSIP schools on May 19, 2022 and October 13, 2022. Additionally, a session on Reading and the Continuous Improvement Cycle was held with all SSIP schools on August 9, 2022, along with a session for the scale up schools which was held on February 16, 2022.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 116 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 80 |
| Response Rate | 68.97% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school  | 7 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  | 36 |
| 3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed) | 0 |
| 4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed). | 1 |

| **Measure** | **Number of respondent youth** | **Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 7 | 80 | 10.53% | 11.00% | 8.75% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 43 | 80 | 52.63% | 54.00% | 53.75% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4) | 44 | 80 | 53.95% | 55.00% | 55.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | For FFY 2021, Guam Part B did not meet the 11% target for 14A with its performance of 8.75%. This is a slippage of 1.78% from the 10.53% performance during FFY 2020. Upon review of the data for the Leavers who were "Not Engaged," respondents reported it was difficult for them to attend school because they were either caring for family members who were ill or were having a difficult time overall one year after graduating from high school. Other Leavers responded by saying COVID-19 still impacted them as a reason for not being engaged after graduating from high school. Some replied by saying it was difficult for them to find a job or they were not ready to seek higher education.  |

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Response Rate  | 69.09% | 68.97% |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

Guam Part B's response rate for Indicator 14 for FFY 2021 is 68.97%. This means that of the 116 students who left school last year, post school outcome information was not available for 31.03% (n=36) of the Leavers who exited the Guam Department of Education. This FFY 2021 response rate is a slight decrease (0.12%) from last year's response rate of 69.09% (76/110) for Indicator 14.

Initially, surveys were sent out through the mail using the home addresses on file. Personnel from the Division of Special Education's Transition Office found it quite challenging as many of the surveys mailed out came back with a "Return to Sender" message. Other attempts to contact the Leavers included contacting them through phone or through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram. Many of the phone numbers on record were either disconnected or no longer in service; and although contacts were made with some Leavers via social media, the Leavers did not respond to requests made for them to contact Division personnel.

Guam Part B will continue its efforts to increase the response rate for Indicator 14. Additional steps to increase the response rate will include follow-up activities with the Leavers and/or their families to ensure that the respondents are representative of Guam's population:

- Before leaving or graduating from school, work with Leavers to get updated demographics such as phone numbers or email addresses;
- At least twice during the school year, ensure the demographics are updated before students exit high school; and
- Continue alternative social media methods, such as FaceBook and InstaGram.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

Guam Part B used the NTACT Response Calculator to calculate representativeness of the respondent group of the characteristics of: (a) disability type; (b) ethnicity; (c) gender; and (d) exit status (e.g., dropout) to determine whether the youth who responded to the interviews were similar to or different from the total population of youth with an IEP who exited school in 2020-2021. According to the NTACT Response Calculator, differences between the Respondent Group and the Target Leaver Group of plus/minus 3% are important. Negative differences indicate an under-representativeness of the group and positive differences indicate over-representativeness. In the Response Calculator, the color red is used to indicate a difference exceeding a plus/minus 3% interval.

For FFY 2021, there were a total number of 116 Leavers. Of the 116 Leavers, 80 responded to the post-school outcomes survey. In reviewing the race/ethnicity of the total Leaver population, 16.38% (19/116) represented the Asian population and 81.90% (95/116) represented the Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander population. Upon review of the respondents, 16.25% (13/80) represented the respondents who were of Asian descent, while 81.25% (65/80) represented the respondents who were of Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander descent. Using the plus/minus 3% interval when determining the over-representativeness or under-representativeness for race/ethnicity, there does not appear to be any over-representativeness or under-representativeness when analyzing the race/ethnicity data for the respondents and non-respondents for the Leavers who fall under Asian or Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander categories. The race/ethnicity demographic data for youth who responded to the post-school outcomes survey and who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school are representative of this population.

Additionally, for FFY 2021, Guam reports that its respondents are not representative of the 2020-2021 leaver population based on data reported in the NTACT Response Calculator; specifically, the respondents were under-represented in the specific learning disability category, which was different from the FFY 2020 data which showed under-representativeness in the emotional disability, intellectual disability, and all other disability categories.

The NTACT calculator revealed 60% of the respondent population represented individuals with a specific learning disability. If the entire SLD leavers responded to the post-school outcomes survey, the total SLD population would have represented 63.79% of the total Leaver population; hence the under-representativeness of -3.79% of leavers who have a specific learning disability. The other disability categories of emotional disabilities, intellectual disabilities, and all other disabilities were also reviewed. The NTACT Calculator showed no over-representativeness or under-representativeness in these disability categories.

Furthermore, there was no over-representation or under-representation in any of the other categories such as gender and or status of exit (graduated with a high school diploma or dropped out) based on the NTACT Response Calculator.

The steps Guam Part B will take to reduce any identified bias and to promote responses from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the same time they left school continue to be through the updates of demographics before students leave high school and through the use of social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram.

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

Guam Part B used the NTACT Response Calculator to calculate representativeness of the respondent group of the characteristics of: (a) disability type; (b) ethnicity; (c) gender; and (d) exit status (e.g., dropout) to determine whether the youth who responded to the interviews were similar to or different from the total population of youth with an IEP who exited school in 2019-2020. According to the NTACT Response Calculator, differences between the Respondent Group and the Target Leaver Group of plus/minus 3% are important. Negative differences indicate an under-representativeness of the group and positive differences indicate over-representativeness. In the Response Calculator, the color red is used to indicate a difference exceeding a plus/minus 3% interval.

For FFY 2021, there were a total number of 116 Leavers. Of the 116 Leavers, 80 responded to the post-school outcomes survey. In reviewing the race/ethnicity of the total Leaver population, 16.38% (19/116) represented the Asian population and 81.90% (95/116) represented the Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander population. Upon review of the respondents, 16.25% (13/80) represented the respondents who were of Asian descent, while 81.25% (65/80) represented the respondents who were Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. Using the plus/minus 3% interval when determining the over-representativeness or under-representativeness for race/ethnicity, there does not appear to be any over-representativeness or under-representativeness when analyzing the race/ethnicity data for the respondents and non-respondents for the Leavers who fall under Asian or Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander categories. The race/ethnicity demographic data for youth who responded to the post-school outcomes survey and who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school are representative of this population.

Stakeholders agreed to review data representing the disability categories of the Leaver population based on the results of the NTACT Response Calculator. For FFY 2021, the NTACT Response Calculator revealed the respondents were under-represented in the specific learning disability category by -3.79%. The NTACT calculator revealed 60% of the respondent population represented individuals with a specific learning disability. If the entire SLD population responded to the post-school outcomes survey, the total SLD population would have represented 63.79% of the total Leaver population. The other disability categories such as emotional disabilities, intellectual disabilities, and all other disabilities were also reviewed. The NTACT Calculator showed no over-representativeness or under-representativeness in these disability categories.

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

Guam Part B’s response rate for Indicator 14 for FFY 2021 was 68.97%. This means that of the 116 students who left school last year, post-school outcome information was not available for 31.03% (n = 36) of the Leavers who exited the Guam Department of Education. This FFY 2021 response rate is a slight decrease of 0.13% from last year’s response rate of 69.10 % rate for Indicator 14.

As previously reported, post-school outcomes surveys were sent out through the mail using the home addresses on file. Many of the surveys mailed out came back with a “Return to Sender” message. Other attempts to contact the Leavers included contacting them through phone or social media such as Facebook and Instagram. As in previous years, many of the phone numbers on record were either disconnected or no longer in service. Although contacts were made with some Leavers via the social media, the Leavers did not respond to requests made for them to contact Division personnel.

Guam Part B will continue its efforts to increase the response rate for Indicator 14, with particular attention to the Leavers that fall under the specific learning disability category. Additional steps to increase the response rate will include follow-up activities with the Leavers and/or their families and to ensure that the respondents are representative of Guam’s population:

- Before leaving or graduating from school, the demographics are updated.
- Ensure demographics are updated periodically within the year before leaving high school.
- Continue alternative social media methods, such as Facebook and Instagram

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

As reported in previous sections, Guam Part B used the NTACT Response Calculator to calculate representativeness of the respondent group on the characteristics of: (a) disability type, (b) ethnicity, (c) gender, and (d) exit status (e.g., dropout) to determine whether the youth who responded to the interviews were similar to, or different from, the total population of youth with an IEP who exited school in 2020-2021.

According to the NTACT Response Calculator, differences between the Respondent Group and the Target Leaver Group of ±3% are important. Negative differences indicate an under-representativeness of the group and positive differences indicate over-representativeness.

In the Response Calculator, red is used to indicate a difference exceeding a ±3% interval.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used?  | NO |
| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| Was a survey used?  | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, Guam must report whether the FFY 2021 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions Guam is taking to address this issue. Guam must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

For FFY 2021, Guam reported on the representativeness of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. Guam also reported on the actions taken to address the issue if the demographics were not representative of the youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect by the time they left school.

Guam also included it's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

This information is reported in the section labeled: 14 - Indicator Data.

## 14 - OSEP Response

## 14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, Guam must report whether the FFY 2022 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions Guam is taking to address this issue. Guam must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

# Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results Indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/02/2022 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 1 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/02/2022 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 1 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.

- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).

- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held to review all the Indicators for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, One session was held virtually, while the other session was a hybrid presentation, whereby stakeholders had the opportunity to attend either virtually or in-person.

- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.

- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.

- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2020-2021, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.

- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.

- Two in-person sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the Logic Model, the Theory of Action, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP. Several planning meetings and core team meetings were also held throughout the year to determine next steps for the SSIP.

Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:

April 19, 2022: At a regularly scheduled Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD) meeting, compliance Indicators 11, 12, 13, along with Indicators 15 and 16, were presented. Drill down data was also presented to discuss areas of concern for Indicators 11 and 13. Those present at the meeting included parents of children with disabilities, a Guam Education Board Member, and parents who are members of the Autism Communities Together (ACT), the Down Syndrome Society, and the Guam Parent and Training Information (PTI) Center.

April 26, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with parent members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), data for Indicators 1 and 2 were presented, which included disaggregated data for each of the high schools for students with disabilities who exited the system either through graduation or dropping out.

May 9, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with GAPSD members, Indicators 5 and 6 were presented, along with disaggregated data for each of the LRE settings, to discuss reasons for slippage for 5A and 6B. Stakeholders discussed possible reasons for the slippage and ways the programs could provide support to the teachers and students with disabilities and their families so education could be provided in more inclusive settings with typically developing peers.

August 5, 2022: During the GDOE Division of Special Education’s Orientation Session (Back to School), data and performance from the Compliance Indicators 11, 12, and 13 were shared with personnel. The purpose of the presentation was two-fold: to share performance data and to review the standards of practice and expectations for Indicators 11 and 13, whereby Division personnel play an important role in meeting the compliance targets for these Indicators.

December 5, 2022: A focus group session was held with Division personnel comprised of SPED Coaches whose task is to provide technical assistance, training and support to school personnel. Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13 and 14 were presented during this session. A discussion ensued referencing possible areas of improvement, especially for Indicators 5, 11, 13 and 14.

January 3 & 9, 2023: Focus group sessions were held with personnel from the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Program comprised of teachers and services providers. The purpose was to review data from Indicators 6, 7, and 12. The group drilled down data for Indicators 6 and 7 to determine reasons for the slippage in performance. Correlations were made between the LRE and the performance in the early childhood outcomes, most especially for Indicator 7, summary statements 2 in all three outcome areas. The group then developed plans for next steps to address the slippage for Indicators 6 and 7.

January 18 & 28, 2023: The full SPP/APR for FFY 2021 was presented to stakeholders on both these dates. January 18, 2023 was delivered virtually to members from the GAPSD, family and parents from parent groups (ACT, Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI), and members from the GEB. On January 28, 2023, the full SPP/APR was also presented both in-person and virtually to Division personnel, school teachers, members from GAPSD, along with family members and parents from ACT, the Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI, a member from the GEB, and a high school student with disabilities. These presentations included the data and updates on the SSIP. Participants appreciated the information shared on the “5 Why’s” to show possible reasons for no progress on the SSIP target for FFY 2021.

For Indicator 8: Several focus groups and planning sessions were held on February 10, 2022, March 31, 2022, and July 23, 2022. Members included GDOE Division of personnel in charge of Parent Services, consultants from the University of Guam CEDDERS, and GAPSD parent members.

For Indicator 17 – SSIP: Nine planning meetings with GDOE personnel and UOG CEDDERS were held throughout the school year to ensure the SSIP schools were implementing PDSAs, conducting aimswebPlus assessments with fidelity, providing explicit instruction in reading, and overall, following the activities outlined in the SSIP. In addition to the planning meetings, seven core team meetings were held with the SSIP Principals, the teacher leaders, parents from the SSIP schools to review the Theory of Action, Logic Model, and Evaluation Plan. Two large stakeholder group meetings were also held with all personnel, inclusive of parents, from the SSIP schools on May 19, 2022 and October 13, 2022. Additionally, a session on Reading and the Continuous Improvement Cycle was held with all SSIP schools on August 9, 2022, along with a session for the scale up schools which was held on February 16, 2022.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data | 85.71% | 100.00% | 50.00% | 87.50% | 33.33% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 1 | 33.33% |  | 100.00% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

As reported in the Guam Part B 618 Data Table 7: Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B, of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, for reporting year 2021-2022, there was one (1) resolution session resolved through a settlement agreement during FFY 2021.

The resolution session was held and resolved though a written settlement agreement.

Additionally, per OSEP’s instructions, states are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. Guam Part B, therefore, has not established a baseline or determined targets for Indicator 15.

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

Guam reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2021. Guam is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

## 15 - Required Actions

# Indicator 16: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1 Mediations held | 0 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 0 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.

- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).

- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held to review all the Indicators for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, One session was held virtually, while the other session was a hybrid presentation, whereby stakeholders had the opportunity to attend either virtually or in-person.

- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.

- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.

- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2020-2021, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.

- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.

- Two in-person sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the Logic Model, the Theory of Action, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP. Several planning meetings and core team meetings were also held throughout the year to determine next steps for the SSIP.

Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:

April 19, 2022: At a regularly scheduled Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD) meeting, compliance Indicators 11, 12, 13, along with Indicators 15 and 16, were presented. Drill down data was also presented to discuss areas of concern for Indicators 11 and 13. Those present at the meeting included parents of children with disabilities, a Guam Education Board Member, and parents who are members of the Autism Communities Together (ACT), the Down Syndrome Society, and the Guam Parent and Training Information (PTI) Center.

April 26, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with parent members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), data for Indicators 1 and 2 were presented, which included disaggregated data for each of the high schools for students with disabilities who exited the system either through graduation or dropping out.

May 9, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with GAPSD members, Indicators 5 and 6 were presented, along with disaggregated data for each of the LRE settings, to discuss reasons for slippage for 5A and 6B. Stakeholders discussed possible reasons for the slippage and ways the programs could provide support to the teachers and students with disabilities and their families so education could be provided in more inclusive settings with typically developing peers.

August 5, 2022: During the GDOE Division of Special Education’s Orientation Session (Back to School), data and performance from the Compliance Indicators 11, 12, and 13 were shared with personnel. The purpose of the presentation was two-fold: to share performance data and to review the standards of practice and expectations for Indicators 11 and 13, whereby Division personnel play an important role in meeting the compliance targets for these Indicators.

December 5, 2022: A focus group session was held with Division personnel comprised of SPED Coaches whose task is to provide technical assistance, training and support to school personnel. Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13 and 14 were presented during this session. A discussion ensued referencing possible areas of improvement, especially for Indicators 5, 11, 13 and 14.

January 3 & 9, 2023: Focus group sessions were held with personnel from the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Program comprised of teachers and services providers. The purpose was to review data from Indicators 6, 7, and 12. The group drilled down data for Indicators 6 and 7 to determine reasons for the slippage in performance. Correlations were made between the LRE and the performance in the early childhood outcomes, most especially for Indicator 7, summary statements 2 in all three outcome areas. The group then developed plans for next steps to address the slippage for Indicators 6 and 7.

January 18 & 28, 2023: The full SPP/APR for FFY 2021 was presented to stakeholders on both these dates. January 18, 2023 was delivered virtually to members from the GAPSD, family and parents from parent groups (ACT, Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI), and members from the GEB. On January 28, 2023, the full SPP/APR was also presented both in-person and virtually to Division personnel, school teachers, members from GAPSD, along with family members and parents from ACT, the Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI, a member from the GEB, and a high school student with disabilities. These presentations included the data and updates on the SSIP. Participants appreciated the information shared on the “5 Why’s” to show possible reasons for no progress on the SSIP target for FFY 2021.

For Indicator 8: Several focus groups and planning sessions were held on February 10, 2022, March 31, 2022, and July 23, 2022. Members included GDOE Division of personnel in charge of Parent Services, consultants from the University of Guam CEDDERS, and GAPSD parent members.

For Indicator 17 – SSIP: Nine planning meetings with GDOE personnel and UOG CEDDERS were held throughout the school year to ensure the SSIP schools were implementing PDSAs, conducting aimswebPlus assessments with fidelity, providing explicit instruction in reading, and overall, following the activities outlined in the SSIP. In addition to the planning meetings, seven core team meetings were held with the SSIP Principals, the teacher leaders, parents from the SSIP schools to review the Theory of Action, Logic Model, and Evaluation Plan. Two large stakeholder group meetings were also held with all personnel, inclusive of parents, from the SSIP schools on May 19, 2022 and October 13, 2022. Additionally, a session on Reading and the Continuous Improvement Cycle was held with all SSIP schools on August 9, 2022, along with a session for the scale up schools which was held on February 16, 2022.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data | 100.00% | 0.00% |  |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

As reported in the Guam Part B 618 Data Table 7: Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B, of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, for reporting year 2021-2022, there were no requests for mediations filed during this reporting period.

Additionally, per OSEP’s instructions, States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. When the number of mediations reaches ten or greater, States are to develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and to report on them in the corresponding APR.

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

Guam reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2021. Guam is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## 16 - Required Actions

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

**Measurement**

The State’s SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

**Instructions**

**Baseline Data*:*** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets*:*** In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State’s FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State’s baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State’s targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

*Phase I: Analysis:*

- Data Analysis;

- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;

- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

*Phase II: Plan* (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;

- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and

- Evaluation.

*Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation* (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

**Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP**

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

***Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation***

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2021 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State’s last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2022). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023)) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

**Section A: Data Analysis**

**What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?**

The Guam Department of Education (GDOE), a unitary educational system, facilitated the development of Guam’s FFY 2021 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 17 State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 7, which reports on the progress of the implementation plan and outcomes developed as the vehicle for improvement in infrastructure development and implementation of evidence-based practices for meeting Guam’s SSIP State-Identified Measurable Results (SIMR). In Phase 1 of the SSIP submitted to OSEP on April 1, 2015, Guam identified the following as its SIMR:

There will be an increased percent of students with disabilities in the 3rd grade that will be proficient in reading in the four participating schools as measured by the district-wide assessment.

**Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State’s theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

YES

**Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.**

Changes to GDOE’s Theory of Action (TOA) were made to better reflect and align the high leverage actions being implemented at schools to address the short-term, intermediate, and long-term goals of the SSIP. The TOA was originally developed in 2015. In the span of seven years, SSIP schools have navigated a multitude of changes related to district and school leadership, staff, curriculum, and most recently changes brought about by the global COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, the schools felt it was an opportune time to pause, reflect, and review the TOA to determine if the changes experienced in the system have impacted the TOA. On May 19, 2022, school teams composed of representatives of stakeholder groups (teachers, principals, and families) from the four target schools and the four scale-up schools came together to review the TOA and provide input on possible modifications. Input was compiled and on October 13, 2022, school teams met again to finalize the changes in the TOA.
The updates to the TOA include the following:

1. Continuum of Supports was changed to Improvement Science. Improvement Science encompasses the comprehensive and systematic process that schools have been engaged in to address the reading deficits in classrooms. This process includes data-based decision making in which data from the universal screener is analyzed and used to develop a goal for improvement. This component sets the stage for the Plan-Do-Study-Act wherein data is used to identify a goal for improvement (Plan), implement an evidence-based strategy to address the goal (Do), collect and analyze data to monitor the outcomes for progress or problems (Study), and finally adapt, adopt, or abandon the strategy based on the data that was collected (ACT).

2. Parents and Community as Partners was changed to Families and Community as Partners. This change recognizes that engagement goes beyond parents but rather encompasses the entire family, including the student.

3. Professional Development was changed to Professional Learning. This change recognizes the shift in language used in the district’s State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) and State Strategic Plan that emphasizes the “learning” aspect of training wherein teachers are empowered and recognized as learners, leaders, and knowledgeable professionals who are active participants in their development.

4. Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs). EBPs have always been a hallmark of GDOE’s SSIP journey and was included as an objective in the SSIP Action Plan. However, the strategy was never explicitly detailed in the TOA. Therefore, stakeholders felt it was necessary to include it as a strategy in the TOA to ensure that its use is clear and deliberate and directly connected to the TOA.

5. TA Support, Coaching, & Accountability was changed to TA Support & Coaching. By deleting the term “accountability” from the coherent improvement strategy, SSIP stakeholders acknowledge that TA Support and Coaching can not be successful if coaches and TA providers also function as an evaluator. The term “accountability” evokes this premise and therefore may detract from the goal and purpose of coaching.

6. Development, Implementation, and Monitoring of Individualized Education Program (IEP) was added as a coherent improvement strategy. An integral element of GDOE’s SSIP has been in the development of IEPs that are procedurally and substantively sound. This process ensures that students receive the appropriate Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) that addresses their unique needs. However, the original TOA did not explicitly convey this priority thus prompting this addition.

7. Using Data to Make Informed Decisions was replaced by Monitoring & Accountability. Using Data to Make Informed Decisions is encompassed in the Improvement Science process under the first strategy. Therefore, isolating it as a separate strategy will be redundant and unnecessary. In addition, as aforementioned, Monitoring & Accountability should not be grouped in the same category as TA Support & Coaching as both are distinct and should stand alone.

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

The link to Guam Part B's current Theory of Action is as follows:

https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/2-Special-Education/1874-State-Performance-Plan-and-Annual-Performance-Report.html

**Progress toward the SiMR**

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages)*.***

**Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| FFY 2014 | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 0.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 10.00% | 10.00% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade 3 IEP Students Scored Proficient in Target Schools** | **Grade 3 IEP Students in Target Schools with Valid Scores** | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| x | 11 | x | 0.00% | x | N/A | N/A |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.**

The data source for the FFY 2021 data is the district-wide assessment results for the FFY 2021 (SY2021-2022) assessments which include the ACT Aspire and the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) based on Alternate Academic Achievement Standards (AA-AAAS) for students with significant cognitive disabilities, conducted in Spring 2022. The ACT Aspire is a vertically-scaled and benchmarked system of standards-based assessment that can be used to track progress toward the Common Core State Standards and the ACT College Readiness Standards. It is designed to measure students’ progress in English, Reading, Math, Science, and Writing from grades 3 to 10 toward readiness for college and career, allowing for comparisons from one grade-level to another and one cohort to another (Guam Annual State of Public Education Report, 2019). The MSAA are assessments in English Language Arts (ELA) and Math and are designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities in grades 3-8 and grade 11. The MSAA covers grade-level content standards at a simplified level, and it includes many built-in supports, modified materials, and accommodations.

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR**.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, GDOE began SY 2021-2022 implementing two modes of learning: online instruction and in-person learning. In September 2021, the district shifted to on-line instruction because of a spike in COVID cases. In October, the district implemented a cohort model for in-person learning but by the end of November, the cohort model was replaced by 5-days of in-person instruction. Moreover, online instruction continued seamlessly until the end of the school year. All students receiving in-person instruction participated in the district-wide assessment (ACT Aspire). Online students were asked to come on-campus to take the ACT Aspire. For the ACT Aspire, the student’s raw score is transmuted into a three-digit scaled score that provides a common language for discussing student achievement over time. Scaled scores that are above, at-grade level, below, or significantly below the ACT readiness benchmark are respectively categorized as “Exceeding” (Level 4) , “Ready” (Level 3), “Close” (Level 2), and “In Need of Support” (Level 1). In relation to the SiMR, students placed in Levels 3 and 4 are considered “Proficient”.

Although the MSAA is an online assessment tool, there is no mechanism for students with disabilities to take this assessment remotely. The students need to be physically in school to be assessed by their teachers using the online tool. The students who participated in this assessment were the students who received in-person instruction and online students who came on-campus to take the assessment. Depending on the response modes used by the student (i.e., the student uses eye-gaze or uses gestures or points to responses), the student’s response is entered into the MSAA system by the teacher; or the student enters the response to the questions independently. Students participating in the MSAA are scored on alternate achievement standards and given a scaled score and a corresponding performance level based on their responses. The performance levels are Level 4, Level 3, Level 2, and Level 1. Students who achieved a scaled score and a performance level of 3 or 4 meet expectations of proficiency and would be counted in the SIMR.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

Universal Screener: aimswebPlus

Participation Rates
The participation rate for all students is determined by dividing the number of students screened in the 4 target schools by the number of enrolled students from the same schools. The participation rate for students with IEPs is determined by dividing the # of students with IEPs screened in the 4 target schools by the # of students with IEPs from the same schools.
All students
Fall (F) ‘21: 97% (1016/1047)
Winter (W) ‘22: 85% (958/1121)
Spring (S) ‘22: 91% (1061/1161)
F‘22: 95% (1101/1156)
IEP Students
F’21: 72% (26/36)
W ‘22: 80% (32/40)
S ‘22: 77% (27/35)
F ‘22: 66% (23/35)

Performance Rates
Data shows the percent of students performing average & above (26th percentile & above) in Early Literacy (EL) measures for Kindergarten (K), Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) for grades 1st-3rd & Reading Comprehension (RC) for grades 2nd-3rd. The performance rates were determined by calculating the # of students performing at or above the 26th percentile divided by the total # of students screened. Cohort data largely represents the same group of students as they move from one grade-level to the next; there are some variations in the cohort as new students may have entered the school & some students may have transferred to other schools.
K: Initial Sounds (IS)
All Students: Cohort
F ‘21: 43.4% (117/275)
W ‘22: 54% (148/276)
S ‘22: Not tested in Spring
All Students: SY ‘22-’23
F ‘22 (K): 29% (68/235)
IEP Students: Cohort
F ‘21: x% (x/7)
W ‘22: x% (x/7)
S ‘22: Not tested in Spring
IEP Students: SY ‘22-’23
Fall ‘22 (K): x% (x/12)

K: Letter Naming Fluency (LNF)
All Students: Cohort
F ‘21: 33.8% (93/275)
W ‘22: 45% (125/277)
S ‘22: 54% (159/295)
All Students: SY ‘22-’23
F ‘22: 34% (79/235)
IEP Students: Cohort
F ‘21: x% (x/7)
W ‘22: x% (x/7)
S ‘22: x% (x/7)
IEP Students: SY ‘22-’23
F ‘22 (K): 25% (3/12)

1st: ORF: SY ‘22-’23
All Students
F ‘22: 30% (101/332)
IEP Students
F ‘22: x% (x/5)

2nd: ORF: Cohort
All Students
F ‘21 (1st): 21.8% (47/225)
W ‘22 (1st): 29% (63/220)
S ‘22 (1st): 32% (69/215)
F ‘22 (2nd): 31% (75/240)
IEP Students
F ‘21 (1st): x% (x/5)
W ‘22: (1st): x% (x/3)
S ‘22 (1st): x% (x/4)
F ‘22 (2nd): x% (x/7)

2nd: RC-Cohort
All Students
Note: RC is not tested in the 1st grade.
F ‘22 (2nd): 79% (187/238)
IEP Students
F ‘22 (2nd): 86% (6/7)

3rd: ORF- Cohort
All Students
F ‘21 (2nd): 34% (95/281)
W ‘22 (2nd): 37% (90/246)
S ‘22 (2nd): 39% (107/277)
F ‘22 (3rd): 35% (98/281)
3rd: All Students: SY ‘21-’22
W ‘22 (3rd): 49% (128/262)
S ‘22 (3rd): 46% (129/280)
IEP Students
W ‘22: (2nd): x% (x/5)
S ‘22 (2nd): x% (x/7)
F ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/8)
IEP Students: SY 2021-2022
W ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/8)
S ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/9)

3rd: RC-Cohort
All Students
F ‘21 (2nd): 53% (149/281)
W ‘22 (2nd): 43% (108/252)
S ‘22 (2nd): 48% (134/282)
F ‘22 (3rd): 59% (165/279)
3rd: All Students: SY ‘21-’22
W ‘22 (3rd): 48% (127/267)
S ‘22 (3rd): 42% (116/278)
IEP Students
W ‘22 (2nd): x% (x/5)
S ‘22 (2nd): x% (x/7)
F ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/8)
IEP Students: SY ‘21-’22
W ‘22 (3rd): 38% (3/8)
S ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/9)

Benchmark data shows the percent of students performing at or above the 35th percentile in EL measures & the 45th percentile in Reading measures. The 35th & 45th percentiles demonstrate aimswebPlus’ success probability target scores. Students scoring at these target benchmarks have an 80% or more likelihood of passing the 3rd grade district assessment. The performance rates were determined by calculating the # of students performing at or above the 35th or 45th percentile divided by the total # of students screened.

K: IS
All Students: Cohort
F ‘21: 30.6% (82/268)
W ‘22: 41% (112/276)
S ‘22: Not tested in Spring
All Students: SY ‘22-’23
F ‘22 (K): 23% (54/235)
IEP Students: Cohort
F ‘21: x% (x/7)
W ‘22: x% (x/7)
S ‘22: Not tested in Spring
IEP Students: SY ‘22-’23
F ‘22 (K): x% (x/12)

K: LNF
All Students: Cohort
F ‘21: 32.8% (88/268)
W ‘22: 39% (107/277)
S ‘22: 54% (159/295)

All Students: SY ‘22-’23
F ‘22: 23% (54/235)
IEP Students: Cohort
F ‘21: x% (x/7)
W ‘22:x% (x/7)
S ‘22: x% (x/7)
IEP Students: SY ‘22-’23
F ‘22 (K): 25% (3/12)

1st: ORF: SY ‘22-’23
All Students
F ‘22: 23% (75/332)
IEP Students
F ‘22: x% (x/5)

2nd: ORF-Cohort
All Students
F ‘21 (1st): 17.4% (38/219)
W ‘22 (1st): 28% (61/220)
S ‘22 (1st): 22% (48/215)
F ‘22 (2nd): 19% (45/240)
IEP Students
F ‘21 (1st): x% (x/5)
W ‘22 (1st): x% (x/3)
S‘22 (1st): x% (x/4)
F ‘22 (2nd): x% (x/7)

2nd: RC-Cohort
All Students
Note: RC is not tested in 1st grade.
F ‘22 (2nd): 31% (73/238)
IEP Students
Note: RC is not tested in 1st grade.
F ‘22 (2nd): x% (x/7)

3rd: ORF- Cohort
All Students
F ‘21 (2nd): 24% (68/281)
W ‘22 (2nd): 23% (57/246)
S ‘22 (2nd): 25% (70/277)
F ‘22 (3rd): 17% (48/281)
3rd: All Students: SY ‘21-’22
W ‘22 (3rd): 24% (64/262)
S ‘22 (3rd): 28% (79/280)
IEP Students
W ‘22 (2nd): x% (x/5)
S ‘22 (2nd): x% (x/7)
F ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/8)
IEP Students: SY ‘21-’22
W ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/8)
S ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/9)

3rd: RC-Cohort
All Students
F ‘21 (2nd): 26% (72/281)
W ‘22 (2nd): 25% (62/252)
S ‘22 (2nd): 26% (74/282)
F ‘22 (3rd): 33% (93/279)
3rd:All Students: SY ‘21-’22
W ‘22: 36% (96/267)
S ‘22: 28% (78/278)
IEP Students
W ‘22 (2nd): x% (x/5)
S ‘22 (2nd): x% (x/7)
F ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/8)
Students w/IEPs: SY ‘21-’22
W ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/8)
S ‘22 (3rd): x% (x/9)

Summary: Participation Rates
The participation rate for all students, inclusive of those with IEPs, decreased by 2% from the last reporting period (F‘21) with 95% students screened in F‘22 as compared to 97% in F‘21. However, the disaggregation of the data by students with IEPs indicates there was an 8% decrease in participation from the last reporting period for students with IEPs with only 66% screened in F‘22 as compared to 72% in F‘21. The data indicate a large gap between the participation of all students & students with IEPs. Recommendations include a root cause analysis be conducted to understand the considerable disparity between the 2 groups in order to identify strategies to increase participation rates for students with IEPs.

Performance Rates
The performance rates looked at cohort data as students in the same cohort moved from one grade-level to the next. Data was examined for both “average & above'' & “benchmark & above” categories to assess progress towards the SiMR. In examining the data, the results indicate progress being made when looking at the data for all students in grades K-3. However, in disaggregating the data by students with IEPs, there is a gap between the performance of all students & students with IEPs. Percent change between F’21 data & the latest data point was calculated by finding the difference between the two percentages, dividing the answer by the 2nd percentage, & multiplying the # by 100 to determine the percent of increase or decrease. Notable increases in performance percentages are detailed below:

Average & Above
24% increase in IS for K from F‘21-W ‘22 for all students
59% increase in LNF for K from F ‘21-W ‘22 for all students
102% increase in LNF for K from F ‘21-W ‘22 for IEP students
42% increase in ORF for 2nd GR from F ‘21 when students were in 1st GR to F ‘22 when they entered 2nd GR (all students)
2% increase in RC for 3rd GR from F ‘21 when students were in 2nd GR to F ‘22 when they entered 3rd GR (all students)

Benchmark & Above
33% increase in IS for K from F ‘21-W ‘22 for all students
64% increase in LNF for K from F ‘21-W ‘22 for all students
102% increase in LNF for K from F ‘21-W ‘22 for IEP students
26% increase in RC for 3rd GR from F ‘21 when students were in 2nd GR to F ‘22 when they entered 3rd GR (all students)

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State’s ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.**

In November 2021, in-person instruction resumed for 5-days a week. Students not receiving in-person instruction received online instruction. The ACT Aspire and MSAA summative assessments were conducted in the Spring of 2022. Students receiving in-person instruction participated in the district’s summative assessments. However, online students were asked to come on-campus to take the summative assessments. Not all online students abided with the district’s request to report to campus for testing. As a consequence, data completeness was significantly impacted due to the COVID-19 pandemic. In SY 2018-2019, pre-pandemic participation rates for all 3rd grade students was 96% (2102/2189). For 3rd grade students with IEPs, the participation rate for the same school year was 100% (80/80) (GDOE ASPER, 2019). For SY 2020-2021, the participation rate for all 3rd grade students was 42% (880/2110). For 3rd grade students with IEPs, the participation rate was 43% (30/69) (GDOE ASPER, 2021). For this reporting year, participation rates for 3rd graders increased to 87% (1692/1928). Third-grade students with IEP’s who participated in the ACT Aspire were 86% (56/65). Though there was an increase in participation rates from the previous school year, the pandemic participation rates remain 10% lower than pre-pandemic participation rates. For students with disabilities who were tested in the district-wide assessment using an alternate assessment using alternate achievement standards (AA-AAS), the participation rate for 3rd-grade students was 75% (9/12). The pre-pandemic participation rate for students on the AA-AAS was 100% (21/21).

For the four SSIP target schools, the participation rate for 3rd grade students with IEPs was 89% (8/9) which is an increase from the last reporting period which had a participation rate of 44% (4/9). For general education students in the target schools, the participation rate was also 89% (270/302) which is an increase from last year’s rate of 79% (165/210). In both groups of students, there were significant increases from the last reporting year but the rates were still lower than pre-pandemic rates. Therefore, data completeness was impacted as a result of COVID-19.

To mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection, GDOE called families of students who were receiving online instruction and highly encouraged them to bring their child/ren to the school campus to take the district-wide assessment.

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State’s current evaluation plan.**

The link to Guam Part B's current Evaluation Plan is as follows:

https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/2-Special-Education/1874-State-Performance-Plan-and-Annual-Performance-Report.html

**Is the State’s evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.**

The changes to the evaluation plan are reflective of the changes in the TOA which were changed to better align with the improvement activities conducted at SSIP schools – see changes in Coherent Improvement Strategies under prompt: Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

In addition to the changes in the Coherent Improvement Strategies, the following changes were incorporated into the evaluation plan:
- development of a scoring criteria to measure the level of activity implementation. A score of “1” indicates little or no implementation; “2” is some implementation; “3” is moderate implementation; and “4” is strong implementation;
- identification of evaluation roles and responsibilities;
- clear articulation of the linkages between the improvement strategies and the intended outputs and outcomes; and
- update of evaluation questions and performance indicators to reflect the revised Coherent Improvement Strategies and to ensure that only the most important and meaningful outcomes related to the SSIP are being evaluated.

**If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.**

The SSIP evaluation plan had not been revisited since 2015. Within this time, significant changes in the system occurred including the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. As a result, the SSIP Core Team felt it was imperative to revisit the TOA, the Logic Model and the evaluation plan to identify strengths, gaps, and weaknesses. Stakeholders were involved in this self-assessment of the evaluation process. Two work sessions with stakeholders were held and input was collected on possible changes to the evaluation plan, TOA, and Logic Model. This process resulted in changes in all three components. The rationale for the changes are centered in ensuring that there is a clear connection between outputs, outcomes, and activities. In addition, stakeholders assessed whether there was an evident articulation between the outcomes, the TOA, and the Logic Model. In the original evaluation plan, the connection to the three elements was not well-defined. In addition, performance indicators were revisited to certify that they are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Timely (S.M.A.R.T.).

As a consequence of the stakeholder work sessions, specific changes in the evaluation plan were made. These changes included the following:
- development of a scoring criteria to measure the level of activity implementation;
- identification of evaluation roles and responsibilities;
- clear articulation of the linkages between the improvement strategies and the intended outputs and outcomes; and
- update of evaluation questions and performance indicators to reflect the revised Coherent Improvement Strategies and to ensure that only the most important and meaningful outcomes related to the SSIP are being evaluated.

In summary, the rationale for the changes in the evaluation plan are centered on solidifying the connection between outcomes, the TOA, and the Logic Model and ensuring that evaluation activities are relevant and meaningful and can be operationalized in tandem with implementation efforts.

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

The SSIP Logic Model (LM) provided the framework for how support was provided to the participating schools to improve infrastructure at the district and school levels. Each of the outcomes in the LM was aligned with the Coherent Improvement Strategies (CIS) in the Theory of Action (TOA). Each outcome is supported by activities that demonstrate how the LM is implemented. The TOA, which is linked in this report, demonstrates the connection between the CIS to the goals of the SSIP. The following details each CIS, the corresponding outcomes from the LM and the related activities and is organized the following way:
- CIS: Infrastructure improvement strategies that will guide the development and implementation of specific activities that support the achievement of SSIP goals
- Outcomes: Targets in the SSIP LM that define the success of each CIS
- Activities: The specific steps related to the CIS that were implemented to achieve the SSIP goals

CIS #1: Improvement Science
Short-term Outcome: Administrators, teachers, and instructional coaches at SSIP schools have increased knowledge in improvement science.
Intermediate Outcomes:
- Administrators and teachers implement PDSA cycles as designed and modify as needed.
- Teachers have increased knowledge in data-based decision making.
Long-Term Outcome: SiMR
Activities:
- Professional Learning (PL) sessions on PDSAs, data literacy, data-based decision making, and EBPs
- Fidelity observations on the administration of the universal screener
- Observations and feedback on classroom PDSAs

CIS #2: Families and Community as Partners
Short-Term Outcome: Administrators and teachers at SSIP schools have increased knowledge and skills in implementing evidence-based family engagement strategies to support improved reading.
Intermediate Outcomes:
- SSIP schools are implementing family engagement strategies for improving reading.
- Families reported that they are knowledgeable about strategies for supporting reading at home and in the community.
Long-Term Outcome: SiMR
Activities:
- Leveraging State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) work team sessions to include SSIP principals, an SSIP teacher, and SSIP parents
- SPDG Leading by Convening trainers include an SSIP principal, teacher, and parent
- GAPSD-considered Guam’s Part B “broad” stakeholder group of individuals who provide input, suggestions, and recommendations for improving special education and related services for children with disabilities on Guam. One of the SSIP Core Team members is also a GAPSD member and a GEB member who shares information with the panel and board members, respectively.

CIS #3: Professional Learning (PL)
Short-Term Outcome: PL policy and procedures were developed that encompassed research-based practices and elements of high-quality practice-based opportunities.
Intermediate Outcomes:
- PL activities adhered to established professional learning policy and procedures.
- Teachers at SSIP schools reported they were satisfied with the quantity and intensity of the professional learning activities provided by GDOE.
Long-Term Outcome: SiMR
Activities:
- Discussion & research on the procedures & standards for quality, evidence-based PL
- Leveraging SPDG to engage stakeholders in building a more responsive PL system to improve reading

CIS#4: EBPs
Short-Term Outcome: Teachers at the SSIP schools have increased knowledge in the implementation of EBPs and supplemental interventions in reading.
Intermediate Outcomes:
- Teachers at the SSIP schools implemented EBPs in reading with fidelity.
- Teachers in the SSIP schools implemented EBPs for supplemental interventions in reading for struggling readers.
Long-Term Outcomes: SiMR
Activities:
- PL sessions on EBPs for reading (Science of Reading)
- PL sessions on the Reading Mastery program for RRTs

CIS #5: TA Support & Coaching
Short-Term Outcome: Teachers at SSIP schools receiving TA support and coaching reported increased knowledge and skills in reading instruction.
Intermediate Outcome: Teachers at SSIP schools implemented EBPs and supplemental interventions with fidelity.
Long-Term Outcome: SiMR
Activities:
- PL sessions provided by the district and the Progress Center for SpEd coaches on IEP components and development
- PL provided by the district to build the capacity of Instructional Coaches (ICs) to include training from REL on improving teacher performance through instructional coaching and training to ICs on the district’s universal screener
- IC coaching activities for SSIP schools: Creating SMART goals and PDSAs, aimswebPlus data analysis, coaching for aimswebPlus school managers, classroom observations with feedback, and supporting new teachers
- SpEd coaches activities for SSIP schools: Coaching on the development of PLAAFP and goals

CIS # 6: Development, Implementation, and Monitoring of Individualized Education Program (IEP)
Short-term Outcome: IEP teams increased their knowledge and skills in the development of IEP components for students with IEPs.
Intermediate Outcome: IEP Teams developed, reviewed, and revised IEPs to ensure they are procedurally and substantively sound.
Long-Term Outcome: SiMR
Activities:
- PL sessions for SpEd coaches on IEP development from the Progress Center
- PL session for SpEd coaches in using universal screener for PLAAFP development
- Coaching on IEP development provided to IEP teams by SpEd coaches
- Coaching on specific IEP stipulations by SpEd coaches

CIS #7: Monitoring & Accountability
Short-term Outcome: Teachers at SSIP schools have increased knowledge in EBPs for supplemental interventions and SDI in reading.
Intermediate Outcome: Teachers at SSIP schools implemented EBPs for supplemental interventions and SDI in reading with fidelity.
Long-Term Outcome: SiMR
Activities:
- Fidelity observations for the implementation of Reading Mastery in the Resource Room
- Classroom observations on the implementation of PDSAs
- Fidelity observations on the administration of the universal screener

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

CIS#1: Improvement Science
Outcomes achieved:
- Administrators, teachers, & instructional coaches have increased knowledge in improvement science.
- Administrators & teachers implement PDSA cycles as designed and modify as needed.
The outcomes for CIS#1 support governance as it ensures that leadership at the school & local levels advocate for appropriate resources & effectively plan, communicate, & collaborate to drive ongoing system improvement. It is also related to data and accountability/monitoring & quality standards as data is used to inform decisions & to support the implementation of quality programs. CIS#1 supports system change & is necessary for the achievement of the SiMR, sustainability of systems improvements efforts & scale-up by ensuring administrators & teachers are equipped with the knowledge & skills to guide the implementation of EBPs & data-based decision making. Data collected to assess the outcome for this CIS are classroom observations, teachers surveys, & document reviews.

CIS#2: Family and Community Partners
Outcomes still in progress:
-SSIP schools are implementing family engagement strategies for improving reading.
- Families reported they are knowledgeable about strategies for supporting reading at home & in the community.
The outcomes for CIS#2 are related to governance, professional development, & technical assistance. The focus of CIS#2 is on building administrative structures that maximize family engagement. CIS#2 involves providing opportunities for families to engage in learning opportunities centered on what they can do at home & in the community to support their child/ren’s reading progress, which supports achievement of the SiMR. No formal TA activities were conducted for this reporting period as the focus was on alleviating the impacts of the pandemic on learning through a targeted focus on classroom instruction. However, SSIP classroom teachers have been working directly with families to engage them in activities to support families at home. Parent interviews were conducted to gather information from families with a child/ren with an IEP on how schools were helping families to support their child/ren in reading during & after the pandemic.

CIS#3: PL
Outcome achieved: Teachers from the SSIP Schools were satisfied with the quantity and intensity of the professional learning provided by GDOE.
The outcome for CIS#3 is related to professional development/technical assistance, data, & quality standards. Key to building the capacity of teachers is using data to determine critical areas for PL & to inform practices. The intended outputs accomplished as a result of the implementation activities include the number of school-level, job-embedded sessions that were conducted. Improvement Science PL sessions were primarily focused on scale-up schools. Target schools received PL related to the Reading Mastery program which is used as an intervention in the resource room & to assist in the delivery of SDI for students with IEPs.
Another outcome that is still in progress is the development of PL standards & procedures to ensure that the PL is of high quality. This outcome is aligned with GDOE’s SPDG which is focused on creating a more responsive & relevant PL system that engages all stakeholders, including families. By leveraging the resources from the SPDG, the goal is to create a PL system that is sustained, intensive, collaborative, job-embedded, data-driven, & classroom focused. In doing so, GDOE recognizes the benefits of calibrating initiatives & supports to meet the diverse needs of students with disabilities. These indicators support system change & are necessary for achievement towards the SiMR because it is centered on developing the skill-set of front-line implementers in the use of EBPs through high-quality PL. End of PL teacher surveys were conducted to determine the perception of knowledge gained after sessions and to communicate achievement of the outcome.

CIS#4: EBPs
Outcome achieved: Teachers at the SSIP schools have increased knowledge in the implementation of EBPs & interventions in reading.
This outcome is related to professional development/technical assistance, data, accountability/monitoring, & quality standards. The use of EBPs in reading increases the likelihood of positive student outcomes & increases responsiveness to learner needs. Therefore, this CIS supports system change & is necessary for achievement towards the SiMR.
The outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities include the number of PL & coaching sessions provided to RRTs in Direct Instruction (Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading) in order to ensure implementation to fidelity of EBP reading interventions for students with IEPs. The outcome was assessed through classroom observations & teacher surveys.

CIS#5: TA Support & Coaching
Outcome achieved: Teachers at SSIP schools implemented EBPs & interventions with fidelity.
The goal of CIS#5 is that teachers are knowledgeable & capable of delivering EBPs & interventions in reading. Therefore, the outcome is related to professional development/technical assistance, data, & quality standards.
Coaching supports fidelity of implementation through a focus on adherence of instructional procedures, duration, & quality of delivery. This process supports system change, impacts the achievement of the SiMR, & supports scale-up. However, for coaches to competently provide coaching, GDOE must support coaches by building their capacity through PL.
For this reporting period, coaching was provided in the implementation of Direct Instruction (Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading) for students with IEPs in the Resource Room to address their Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) on a monthly basis. CIS#5 is implemented in tandem with CIS#4 (EBPs) & CIS#6 in which TA support & coaching is provided to ensure effective implementation of EBPs & the development of substantive IEPs. The outcome was assessed through classroom fidelity observations.

CIS#6: Development, Implementation, & Monitoring of IEPs
Outcome in Progress: IEP teams increase knowledge & skills in the development of IEP components for students with IEPs. The outcome for CIS#5 is related to professional development/technical assistance & quality standards.
The focus of CIS#6 for this reporting period has been building the capacity of SpEd coaches through TA from the Progress Center in the development of the IEP components. SpEd coaches are at the frontlines in the delivery of technical assistance for teachers & IEP teams. Therefore, the district has invested resources in building their capacity to support teachers & IEP teams. Outputs for this strategy are centered on the number of IEP coaching sessions provided to SSIP schools & the number of IEP reviews conducted. However, since the district has newly adopted the role of SpEd coaches, time has been spent on providing PL to SpEd coaches to build their knowledge and skills to coach. The outcome was assessed through a case study methodology & IEP reviews.

CIS#7: Monitoring & Accountability
Outcome achieved: Teachers at SSIP schools implemented EBPs & supplemental interventions with fidelity.
This outcome is related to governance & quality standards. The focus of CIS#7 is the development of a systematic monitoring system to ensure implementation to fidelity of EBPs & interventions. This is driven by the need to guarantee that all students receive a high-quality education. CIS#7 is tethered to all other CIS as it ensures that all practices are ingrained in the system. This involves classroom observations, core team meetings, & data reviews. As a result, CIS#7 supports achievement towards the SiMR, sustainability of system improvement efforts, & scale-up. The outcome was assessed through the collection of fidelity data through observations & document reviews.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved*.***

1. Continuum of Supports was changed to Improvement Science. Improvement Science encompasses the comprehensive and systematic process that schools have been engaged in to address the reading deficits in classrooms. This process includes data-based decision making in which data from the universal screener is analyzed and used to develop a goal for improvement. This component sets the stage for the Plan-Do-Study-Act wherein data is used to identify a goal for improvement (Plan), implement an evidence-based strategy to address the goal (Do), collect and analyze data to monitor the outcomes for progress or problems (Study), and finally adapt, adopt, or abandon the strategy based on the data that was collected (ACT).

2. Parents and Community as Partners was changed to Families and Community as Partners. This change recognizes that engagement goes beyond parents but rather encompasses the entire family, including the student.

3. Professional Development was changed to Professional Learning. This change recognizes the shift in language used in the district’s State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) and State Strategic Plan that emphasizes the “learning” aspect of training wherein teachers are empowered and recognized as learners, leaders, and knowledgeable professionals who are active participants in their development.

4. Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs). EBPs have always been a hallmark of GDOE’s SSIP journey and was included as an objective in the SSIP Action Plan. However, the strategy was never explicitly detailed in the TOA. Therefore, stakeholders felt it was necessary to include it as a strategy in the TOA to ensure that its use is clear and deliberate and directly connected to the TOA.

5. TA Support, Coaching, & Accountability was changed to TA Support & Coaching. By deleting the term “accountability” from the coherent improvement strategy, SSIP stakeholders acknowledge that TA Support and Coaching can not be successful if coaches and TA providers also function as an evaluator. The term “accountability” evokes this premise and therefore may detract from the goal and purpose of coaching.

6. Development, Implementation, and Monitoring of Individualized Education Program (IEP) was added as a coherent improvement strategy. An integral element of GDOE’s SSIP has been in the development of IEPs that are procedurally and substantively sound. This process ensures that students receive the appropriate Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) that addresses their unique needs. However, the original TOA did not explicitly convey this priority thus prompting this addition.

7. Using Data to Make Informed Decisions was replaced by Monitoring & Accountability. Using Data to Make Informed Decisions is encompassed in the Improvement Science process under the first strategy. Therefore, isolating it as a separate strategy will be redundant and unnecessary. In addition, as aforementioned, Monitoring & Accountability should not be grouped in the same category as TA Support & Coaching as both are distinct and should stand alone.

Note: Short-term and intermediate outcomes achieved were discussed in the previous section.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

CIS #1: Improvement Science
Next Steps:
- Continued coaching and professional learning on the implementation of PDSAs
Anticipated Outcomes:
- Increased implementation of PDSAs in scale-up and target schools
- Increased fidelity in the implementation of the universal screener
- Increased knowledge for K-3 teachers in data literacy and data-based decision-making
- Implementation of at least 3 PDSA cycles a year

CIS #2: Families and Community as Partners
Next Steps:
- Coaching and support to SSIP schools on the implementation of evidence-based family engagement strategies from the Institute of Education Sciences
- Leveraging the work done through the GDOE SPDG to capitalize on the Leading by Convening framework and activities as a mechanism to engage SSIP families
Anticipated Outcomes:
- Increased family engagement activities at SSIP schools
- Increased knowledge of families in strategies for supporting reading at home

CIS #3: Professional Learning
Next Steps:
- Leveraging the work of the GDOE SPDG in developing GDOE’s professional learning policy to encompass the ESEA definition of professional development, the Learning Forward Professional Development Standards, and the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders elements of high-quality practice-based opportunities.
Anticipated Outcomes:
- Increased professional learning activities that encompasses policy and procedures that constitute quality professional learning
- Increased percentage of teachers who were satisfied with the quantity and intensity of the professional learning provided

CIS #4 Evidence-Based Instructional Practices
Next Steps:
- Professional learning and coaching on evidence-based instructional practices.
- Implementation of Lesson Progress Charts to track lesson completion in Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading for students with IEPs.
Anticipated Outcomes:
-Implementation to fidelity of EBPs for reading instruction and interventions
- Improved reading proficiency from one screening to the next for general and special education students.

CIS #5: TA Support & Coaching
Next Steps:
- Continued professional learning for Instructional and SpEd coaches to build their coaching capacity
- Continued coaching for general and special education teachers in evidence-based instructional practices
Anticipated Outcomes:
- Increased knowledge and skills of teachers in EBPs for reading instruction and interventions
- Improved reading proficiency from one screening to the next for general and special education students.

6. CIS #6: Development, Implementation, and Monitoring of Individualized Education Program (IEP)
Next Steps:
- Continued professional learning and coaching on IEP development
 Anticipated Outcomes:
- Increased alignment between IEP components
- Increased use of appropriate accommodations

7. CIS #7: Monitoring & Accountability
Next Steps:
- Continued monitoring of the delivery of SDI and interventions for reading
- Monitoring of lesson completion in Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading to ensure that students with IEPs are achieving appropriate lesson progress.
Anticipated Outcome:
- Increased fidelity in the implementation of SDI and interventions for reading

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

The evidence-based practices implemented during this reporting period include the following:
1. Universal screening
2. Improvement Science (Plan, Do, Study, Act)
3. Explicit Instruction (Reading Mastery Program)
4. Science of Reading (5 Components of Reading)
5. Coaching
6. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

1. Universal Screening
Aligned with CIS #1, 7
Universal screening is a critical first step in identifying students who are at-risk for reading difficulties. Once identified, at-risk students can be provided with the appropriate scope of reading supports and interventions in addition to core instruction. Universal screening is essential in ensuring that reading problems are addressed timely before the achievement gap widens.

2. Improvement Science (Plan, Do, Study, Act)
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Improvement science is the basis for continuous improvement. It is centered on the premise that sustainable change is an ongoing process based on data collection, adaptation, and learning. Continuous improvement is focused on a specific problem and in testing practices and adapting them based on ongoing data collection. Three main questions guide the continuous improvement cycle (Shakman, K., Wogon,D., Rodriguez, S., Boyce, J., & Shaver, D., 2020):
- What problem are we trying to solve?
- What change might we introduce and why?
- How will we know that a change is actually an improvement?

3. Explicit Instruction (Reading Mastery Implementation)
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Explicit instruction is a systematic, direct, purposeful way of teaching. Rosenshine (1987) defines explicit instruction as “a systematic method of teaching with emphasis on proceeding in small steps, checking for understanding, and achieving active and successful participation by all students”. The components of explicit instruction include having a clear objective, modeling, guided practice, independent practice, and supporting practices. GDOE utilizes the Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading program in the resource room as a mechanism for the delivery of explicit and systematic instruction for students with IEPs in the resource room.

4. Science of Reading (5 Components of Reading Instruction)
Aligned with CIS #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
The Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching Children to Read (April 2020) summarized research in the area of reading instruction. The National Reading Panel analysis was clear in its assertion that effective reading instruction must be systematic and explicit and must include the following components: phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

5. Coaching
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6
Based on research by Joyce and Showers (2002), in order for the new skills learned in professional development to be transferred into the classroom, coaching is needed to help teachers successfully implement new knowledge and skills. Through on-going support from coaching, teachers are more likely to implement EBPs with greater fidelity. Coaching supports fidelity of implementation through a focus on adherence of instruction procedures, duration, and quality of delivery.

6. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
The PLC framework is centered on the tenets of improvement science. It is during PLC meetings where the continuous improvement process unfolds. Three overarching principles undergird the PLC framework: ensure that students learn, a culture of collaboration, and a focus on results. In embracing the PLC framework, there is a shift from teaching to learning (Dufour, 2004). There are four focus questions that are threaded through a PLC meeting:
- What do we want students to learn?
- How do we know they’ve learned it?
- What do we do if they haven’t learned it?
- What do we do if they’ve learned it?

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

1. Universal Screening
Aligned with CIS #1, 7
Activities and strategies that supported its use:
- Professional learning on administering the universal screener (aimswebPlus)
- Professional learning on data analysis using aimswebPlus reading data
- Fidelity of administration observations were conducted to ensure that aimswebPlus was being administered with fidelity
Impact on the SiMR
- At-risk students were identified in a timely manner (Change in program practice)
- Data from the screener is used to drive classwide and individual interventions (Change in teacher practices)
- Data from the screener is used for PDSAs (Change in teacher practices)

2. Improvement Science (Plan, Do, Study, Act-PDSAs)
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Activities and strategies that supported its use:
- Professional learning sessions on improvement science, Science of Reading, data analysis, Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading programs
- Fidelity observations on the administration of the universal screener
- PDSA classroom observations
Impact on the SiMR
- Teachers and students use data to develop a goal and strategies to improve deficits in reading. (Change in teacher and student behavior)
- Students take ownership of their data and their learning. (Change in student behavior)
- Facilitates an on-going process of data collection, use of evidence-based practices, and adaptation based on data. (Change in teacher and program practices)
- Provides the basis for the delivery of EBPs and interventions (Change in teacher and program practices)

3. Explicit Instruction (Reading Mastery Implementation)
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Activities and strategies that supported its use
- Professional learning for Resource Room Teachers (RRTs) in the use of explicit instruction in the delivery of the Direct Instruction (DI) Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading Programs
- Coaching for RRTs on the use of explicit instruction with the Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading Programs
Impact on the SiMR
- Increased proficiency in the delivery of the Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading Programs. (Change in teacher practices)
- Reading tasks are broken down into smaller steps to reduce the cognitive load for struggling readers. (Change in teacher practices)
- Practice and corrective feedback are provided in a timely manner to increase the attainment and mastery of reading skills. (Change in teacher practices)

4. Science of Reading (5 Components of Reading Instruction)
Aligned with CIS #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
Activities and strategies that supported its use:
- Professional learning in the use of knowledge of the 5 Components of Reading instruction in the development of PDSAs
- Professional learning in using data from aimswebPlus to determine what area of reading instruction needs to be targeted in instruction and in the development of PDSAs.
- Professional learning of various EBPs that fall under the 5 Components of Reading instruction (e.g. Elkonin boxes, repeated reading, word building, etc.)
Impact on the SiMR
- Increased proficiency in the delivery of effective reading instruction. (Change in teacher practices)
- Students are provided with reading instruction that is balanced and meets their needs. (Change in teacher practices)

5. Coaching
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6
Activities and strategies that supported its use:
- Professional learning sessions from the Progress Center for SpEd coaches on IEP components
- Professional learning provided by the district to build the capacity of Instructional Coaches (ICs) to include training from REL on improving teacher performance through instructional coaching and training to ICs on the district’s universal screener
- IC coaching activities for SSIP schools: Creating SMART goals and PDSAs, aimswebPlus data analysis, coaching for aimswebPlus school managers, classroom observations with feedback, and supporting new SSIP teachers
- SpEd coaches activities for SSIP schools: Coaching on the development of PLAAFP and goals
Impact on the SiMR
- Increased proficiency in the delivery of effective reading instruction. (Change in teacher practices)
- The development of an effective PLAAFP statement and goals drives the determination of the appropriate SDI to meet the unique needs of the student. (Change in teacher practices)

6. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)
 Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6
Activities and strategies that supported its use:
- PLCs provide the mechanism by which aimswebPlus data was analyzed to inform practices and to develop PDSAs
Impact on the SiMR
- Increased and deliberate focus on using data to drive instruction and interventions. (Change in teacher practice)
- Increased and deliberate focus on identifying EBPs to address gaps in instruction and interventions. (Change in teacher practices)

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

Core Team Meeting Notes (CIS#7)
Core team meeting notes were used to determine how monitoring and accountability were conducted.

Universal Screener Fidelity Data (CIS #1, 7)
K-3 teachers from the 4 SSIP target schools were systematically observed in order to examine their assessment practices in the areas of ORF & EL. The practices associated with ORF & EL were observed during the Fall ‘22 administration of the screener. School principals used a standardized protocol and fidelity checklist to determine the level of fidelity in the administration of the aimswebPlus EL and Reading measures. When analyzing the assessment practices in both the areas of ORF & EL, it was found that 90.94% (Level 4-strong implementation) of tasks were implemented with fidelity. In comparison to Fall ‘21, only 69.30% of tasks were implemented with fidelity. Further examination provides evidence that ORF tasks were implemented at a 91.22% fidelity level (Level 4-strong implementation) while EL practices were implemented at 90.18% (Level 4-strong implementation) fidelity rate. In addition to the number of tasks implemented with fidelity, the observation data were analyzed to determine how many teachers were implementing all observed tasks with fidelity. Across the 4 schools, a total of 41 teachers were observed using at least one fidelity checklist. The data indicated that a high percentage of teachers (82.93%) are implementing 85-99% of the tasks with fidelity. Of note, 12% of 2nd-3rd grade teachers did implement all the ORF fidelity checklist tasks with fidelity and 8% of the Kindergarten & 1st grade teachers observed implemented all the tasks with fidelity.

Professional Learning (PL) Feedback (CIS # 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
The following indicates the percentage of satisfaction from participants with the PL content provided during this reporting period:
SSIP School 4 1st Grade Session on the Five Components of Reading & Lesson Planning: 100% (4/4)
Fast ForWord Program Overview & Implementation: 100% (2/2)
SSIP School 4 1st Grade Session on Continuous Improvement in Reading: 100% (3/3)
aimswebPlus Administration Training Session: 92% (12/13)
Progress Monitoring Overview Sessions: 100% (55/55)
Urgency of Reading Proficiency & Continuous Improvement Session for Scale Up Schools: 99% (76/77)
Continuous Improvement in Reading Onsite School Sessions for Scale Up Schools: 100% (31/31)
RM & Corrective Reading Training series for RRTs: 100% (4/4)
SSIP School 1 Kindergarten Direct Instruction Reading Mastery I & II Overview: 100% (2/2)
SSIP School 1 Direct Instruction Reading Mastery Overview: 100% (7/7)
SSIP School 2 Data Literacy: 94% (16/17)
SSIP School 3 Improvement Science: 90% (36/40)
In summary, the overall satisfaction average for participants in PL sessions is 97.91% which is Level 4 or strong implementation indicating that participants find the content and delivery of PL relevant. Next steps include the development of PL policy and standards to ensure that PL is based on practices that are research-based and encompass elements of high-quality practice-based opportunities.

Improvement Science & Science of Reading (SOR) Retrospective PL Survey
As evidenced through PL surveys that measured knowledge increase before & after a session, there was a 95% increase in knowledge of K-3 teachers from the scale-up schools. The teachers reported increased knowledge from “no or low knowledge” before the session to “moderate or high knowledge” after the district session on Improvement Science & the SOR. This percentage is indicative of Level 4 or strong implementation.

Universal Screening Data (CIS #1,7)
aimswebPlus is described under the prompt “Has the state collected additional data?”

IEP File Folder Reviews (CIS #5,6,7)
22 IEPs were reviewed by 6 individuals on 17 indicators using a checklist. The 22 IEPs were for students attending the 4 new scale-up schools & will be used as baseline data. Of the 22 IEPs, the ratings of 11 were removed as the PLAAFP was not current (over 30 days old). This resulted in a summary of the ratings for 11 IEPs. For each IEP component (PLAAFP, Annual Goal, SDI), the IEP is considered to have met the criteria if the IEP component met at least 80% of the indicators. The results demonstrated below represent the percentage of IEPs that met the 80% criteria:
PLAAFP: x% (x/11) of the IEPs
Annual Goals x% (x/11) of the IEPs
SDI: x% (x/11) of the IEPs
The scale-up schools have not received any coaching on IEP development. In contrast, in FFY2020, target schools received coaching on PLAAFP development. Data from IEP file folder reviews of the target schools in FFY2020 showed at least half of the IEPs from the target schools (57% & above) met the indicators under the PLAAFP component as a result of coaching.

Direct Instruction (DI): Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading Classroom Fidelity Data (CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
Observations were conducted at three of the four SSIP school sites with a total of 6 resource room teachers (RRTs). One of the 4 SSIP schools just received a new RRT in December 2022 & DI training was just completed in January 2023. Therefore, no observations were completed for this teacher at the time of reporting. The observations were centered on the fidelity of implementation for the DI Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading programs which are used to address the SDI for students with IEPs as well as to measure the coaching provided by TA providers. All 6 RRTs observed showed that they were using the DI reading programs (Reading Mastery I, Reading Mastery III, and Corrective Reading Decoding B2) with their students in either a 1:1 format or in a small group setting.
Fidelity data, presented below, was collected based on these implementation areas:
- Materials organized and ready: 83% (5/6) Level 4 (Strong Implementation)
- Begins lesson promptly: 100% (6/6) Level 4
- Students on task: 100% (6/6) Level 4
- Follows steps and script in exercises: 83% (5/6) Level 4
- Uses clear signals: 83% (5/6) Level 4
- Students respond on signal in a conversational tone: 67% (4/6) Level 3 (Moderate Implementation)
·- Allows think time: 100% (6/6) Level 4
- Corrects errors : 100% (6/6) Level 4
- Delayed tests for missed items: 83% (5/6) Level 4
- Pacing: 83% (5/6) Level 4
In summary, the classroom observation data of the implementation of DI in the Resource Room demonstrated Level 4 or strong implementation in 90% (9/10) of the fidelity indicators. Next steps include examining lesson progress to ensure that lessons are being completed & students are moving at an appropriate pace through the program.

PDSA Classroom Observations (CIS #1, 3. 4. 6, 7)
SSIP principals from the 4 target schools conducted classroom observations & document reviews to determine the level of implementation of PDSA cycles in grades K-3 to support Improvement Science. The observations showed 97% (59/61) of K-3 teachers in the 4 target schools have implemented a PDSA cycle based on their universal screening data. The two teachers currently not implementing the framework are substitute teachers. This percentage is indicative of Level 4 or strong implementation.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

Improvement Science Survey (CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)
An online survey was conducted in January 2023 to assess the impact of SSIP in the knowledge and skills of teachers in the elements of Improvement Science. Teachers surveyed were K-3 and RRTs from the 4 target schools. The response rate was 83.6% (51/61). Using an agreement scale for the items, categories of Strongly Agree and Agree were used to calculate an overall agreement level about teacher knowledge and skill in the elements of Improvement Science. The results demonstrated the following:
- Data Literacy: 86% (44/51) of teachers indicated knowledge and skill increase through participation in SSIP (Level 4-Strong Implementation)
- Data-based Decision Making: 86% (44/51) of teachers indicated knowledge and skill increase through participation in SSIP (Level 4)
- Development of PDSAs: 92% (47/51) of teachers indicated knowledge and skill increase through participation in SSIP (Level 4).

IEP Case Study Analysis (CIS # 5, 6, 7)
An IEP case study analysis was conducted to collect data on how 2nd grade students with IEPs from the 4 target schools were progressing. The data collected was to assist in determining if students were on-track to meet the SiMR for the next reporting period and to identify areas in need of intensive support. The methodology for the case study centered on conducting IEP file folder reviews. The following information was collected: # minutes for SDI in reading, participation in reading core instruction, Fall ‘22 universal screening data, and the results of the IEP checklist for PLAAFP, Annual Goals, and SDI statements.

A total of ten 2nd grade students were included in the analysis. 6 students had a specific learning disability, x with multiple disabilities, x with intellectual disability, and x with autism. 7 students were in the general education classroom 80% of the time, 3 students were in the general education classroom 40% to 79% of the time. Four students were receiving their SDI in the general education classroom and 6 were receiving it in the resource room. 8 students had 30 minutes of SDI in reading, x had 25 minutes, and x had 20 minutes. The data from the universal screener revealed that all 10 students were well-below average in ORF which indicates a Level 1 or little or no implementation. For RC, x were on or above benchmark, 6 were average, x were below average, and x were not screened for reading comprehension which indicates a Level 3 or moderate implementation. The results between ORF and RC have no correlation which may be indicative of the way in which RC is administered. The data does not reflect any significant difference between the performance of students receiving SDI in the general education classroom in comparison with students receiving SDI in the resource room.

In the area of quality of PLAAFP & Annual Goals using an IEP checklist tool, the results showed the following:
PLAAFP:
- Current data–70% (7/10): Level 3 (Moderate Implementation)
- Valid & reliable assessment–80%(8/10): Level 4
- Measurable & Observable–60% (6/10): Level 3
- Passes the Stranger’s Test–60% (6/10): Level 3
Annual Goals
- Aligned with PLAAFP- x% (x/10): Level 1 (Little or No Implementation)
- Measurable & Observable–100% (10/10): Level 4
- Passes the Stanger’s Test–40% (4/10): Level 2 (Some Implementation)

The case study revealed areas of strength and areas for growth. Areas of strength include: a majority of PLAAFP and Annual Goal statements are measurable and observable; a majority of IEPs included some type of valid and reliable assessments; and the majority of IEPs include current data. Areas for growth include: PLAAFP statements need to be written so it can be understood by the general public and there needs to be alignment in the unit of measurement for the PLAAFP with the annual goal statement.

Teacher Self-Assessment: (CIS # 3, 4, 5, 7)
A teacher self-assessment survey was conducted at the end of SY 2021-2022 to assess the perception of teachers on the implementation of the Science of Reading. The tool used was the How Do I Feel Survey. The survey measured teachers' perceptions on 6 statements related to reading instruction. Teachers rated themselves based on the following Likert scale:
1. Not so clear about this
2. I know a little bit
3. I know about this well
4. I know this well enough to implement in my classroom
5. I have incorporated this in my classroom

67 K-3 teachers completed the survey from the 4 target schools. The implementation items on the survey (#4 and #5) were extrapolated to determine the level of implementation. The data yielded the following results:
1. Reading Big Ideas 49% (33/67) -Level 2
2. Phonemic Awareness 55% (37/67)-Level 3
3. Phonics 63% (42/67) Level 3
4. Fluency 54% (36/67) Level 3
5. Vocabulary 56%(38/67) Level 3
6. Comprehension 56% (38/67) Level 3

In summary, the data on how teachers felt about implementing the 5 Components of Reading Instruction in their classrooms yielded an overall Level 3 or Moderate Implementation.

Parent Interviews (CIS# 2, 7)
Information was gathered from parents on how schools could help families support their children in improving their reading skills and how the COVID-19 pandemic impacted their learning in reading. Telephone interviews were conducted with parents of children with IEPs who attended the 4 target schools. Interviewers asked parents 6 standard questions. Fifty-nine (59) families of students with disabilities across the 4 target schools were identified, and 55 parents were contacted via phone. Of those, 18 (33%) completed the interview. The following provides a summary of the data collected:

Parents who participated in the interview continue to express concern regarding the setbacks their child(ren) have experienced because of the pandemic and virtual learning. Parents expressed worry about both the academic and social emotional impacts that virtual learning has had on their child(ren). Parents reported that online instruction was challenging for students with regards to being able to focus on the computer and understanding instruction that was delivered via the computer. A number of parents reported seeing a regression in their child(ren)’s reading abilities due to the lack of face-to-face instruction and support in the classroom. Parents also discussed the social emotional impacts on their child(ren) as a result of virtual learning.

When asked how the school helped parents to help their child(ren) improve their reading, parents reported schools provided reading materials in appropriate formats as well as provided additional learning tools such as worksheets, flashcards, and other materials specific to the reading curriculum their child was using. Parents also described the strategies teachers and schools used to communicate with parents about their child(ren)’s reading performance. Some examples included using notebooks and journals, emailing information to parents, and using web-based applications such as WhatsApp. Other parents indicated that primary communication with the school and teachers was achieved through student conferences, face to face meetings, or the telephone.

When asked about what additional supports they need from the school, many parents indicated they would like additional materials to help support improving literacy at home. Some suggestions include providing children’s books to parents, other materials that support improving reading skills (e.g., letter flashcards, teacher lesson plans that will help parents identify what areas to focus on). Other recommendations included enhancing parent engagement in the classroom, ensuring supply and use of special education teachers, and considerations for implementing other programming such as Direct Instruction (DI).

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

1. Universal Screening
Aligned with CIS #1, 7
Next Steps:
- Continued PL on data literacy using the universal screener
- Continued PL on progress monitoring
- Continued observations of the administration of the universal screener to ensure that data is being collected with fidelity.
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:
- Increased knowledge and skills in data-based decision making
- Increased proficiency in administering the universal screener with fidelity
- Increased knowledge and skills in implementing progress monitoring
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools proficient in reading as measured by the universal screener

2. Improvement Science (Plan, Do, Study, Act)
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Next Steps:
- Continued PL & coaching on using data from the universal screener to develop PDSAs
- Continued PL on the selection of EBPs for PDSAs
- Continued PL & coaching on the development of classroom PDSAs
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:
- Increased knowledge and skill in developing classroom PDSAs
- Increased knowledge and skill in selecting EBPs for PDSAs
- Increased implementation of EBPs and interventions for reading
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools proficient in reading as measured by the district assessment.

3. Explicit Instruction (Reading Mastery Implementation)
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Next Steps:
- Continued PL & coaching for RRTs on DI Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading programs
- Continued PL & coaching on explicit instruction components and how it can be incorporated with the Science of Reading and the school’s core curriculum.
- Classroom observations and feedback on the delivery of explicit instruction for RRTs
- Implementation of Lesson Progress Charts to track lesson completion in Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading for students with IEPs.
- Monitoring of lesson completion in Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading to ensure that students with IEPs are achieving appropriate lesson progress.
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:
- Increased knowledge and skill in the delivery of explicit instruction through the use of the Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading programs
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools proficient in reading as measured by the universal screener.

4. Science of Reading (5 Components of Reading Instruction)
Aligned with CIS #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
Next Steps:
- Continued PL & coaching on developing PDSAs centered on the components of reading
- Continued PL & coaching on selecting specific EBPs for each of the 5 components of reading instruction.
- PL & coaching on how the SOR is incorporated in the school’s core curriculum.
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:
- Increased knowledge and skill in the selection of EBPs for each of the 5 components of reading
- Increased knowledge and skill in developing PDSAs centered on the 5 components of reading instruction
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools proficient in reading as measured by the universal screener.

5. Coaching
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6
Next Steps:
- Development of a systematic coaching system.
- Continued PL to build the capacity of SpEd and Instructional coaches.
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:
- Teachers implement EBPs & interventions learned through PL and coaching with fidelity
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools proficient in reading as measured by the universal screener.
- Through coaching, RRTs are knowledgeable and skilled in the development of procedurally and substantively sound IEPs.

6. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)
Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Next Steps:
- Continued use of the PLC as a mechanism for the implementation of data-based decision making, PDSAs, and job-embedded PL & coaching.
Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period
- Teachers are able to use the data from the universal screener to develop a classroom PDSA and to make data-based decisions.
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools proficient in reading as measured by the universal screener.

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.**

The following evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modification to the SSIP:
Areas Demonstrating Strong to Moderate Implementation
1. PDSA Classroom Observations–Level 4 (Strong Implementation)
2. Improvement Science Teacher Survey- Level 4 (Strong Implementation)
3. Direct Instruction (Reading Mastery/Corrective Reading) Observations & Coaching- Level 4 (Strong Implementation)
4. Universal Screener Fidelity Observation-Level 4 (Strong Implementation)
5. Professional Learning Surveys–Level 4 (Strong Implementation)
6. Teacher Self- Assessment -Science of Reading (SOR)-Level 3 (Moderate Implementation)
7. Parent Interviews

Areas Demonstrating Some Implementation & Little or No Implementation:
1. Universal Screener Benchmark Data–Level 1 (Little or No Implementation)
2. IEP File Folder Reviews (Scale-up Schools)--Level 1 (Little or No Implementation)
3. SiMR Data –Level 1 (Little or No Implementation)

In summary, the data demonstrates strong implementation in teacher practices. However, the change in teacher practice has not shown the intended impact on student performance. A targeted focus in how these practices are being delivered at the classroom level is critical as a next step for the next reporting period. Continued coaching on the delivery of EBPs to fidelity and progress monitoring need to continue. Leveraging and calibrating supports from Instructional Coaches and SpEd coaches is essential.

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

Guam Part B employed several mechanisms to solicit broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that Guam made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). These mechanisms include the following:

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions and large stakeholder sessions.

- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held for smaller focus groups to discuss Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).

- Two Large stakeholder sessions were held to review all the Indicators for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, One session was held virtually, while the other session was a hybrid presentation, whereby stakeholders had the opportunity to attend either virtually or in-person.

- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants.

- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.

- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2020-2021, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.

- Phone call surveys were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP schools.

- Two in-person sessions were held with Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools to discuss the SIMR, the Logic Model, the Theory of Action, and the evaluation plan for the SSIP. Several planning meetings and core team meetings were also held throughout the year to determine next steps for the SSIP.

Additional information provided below include the dates when sessions were conducted:

April 19, 2022: At a regularly scheduled Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD) meeting, compliance Indicators 11, 12, 13, along with Indicators 15 and 16, were presented. Drill down data was also presented to discuss areas of concern for Indicators 11 and 13. Those present at the meeting included parents of children with disabilities, a Guam Education Board Member, and parents who are members of the Autism Communities Together (ACT), the Down Syndrome Society, and the Guam Parent and Training Information (PTI) Center.

April 26, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with parent members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), data for Indicators 1 and 2 were presented, which included disaggregated data for each of the high schools for students with disabilities who exited the system either through graduation or dropping out.

May 9, 2022: During a scheduled focus group meeting with GAPSD members, Indicators 5 and 6 were presented, along with disaggregated data for each of the LRE settings, to discuss reasons for slippage for 5A and 6B. Stakeholders discussed possible reasons for the slippage and ways the programs could provide support to the teachers and students with disabilities and their families so education could be provided in more inclusive settings with typically developing peers.

August 5, 2022: During the GDOE Division of Special Education’s Orientation Session (Back to School), data and performance from the Compliance Indicators 11, 12, and 13 were shared with personnel. The purpose of the presentation was two-fold: to share performance data and to review the standards of practice and expectations for Indicators 11 and 13, whereby Division personnel play an important role in meeting the compliance targets for these Indicators.

December 5, 2022: A focus group session was held with Division personnel comprised of SPED Coaches whose task is to provide technical assistance, training and support to school personnel. Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13 and 14 were presented during this session. A discussion ensued referencing possible areas of improvement, especially for Indicators 5, 11, 13 and 14.

January 3 & 9, 2023: Focus group sessions were held with personnel from the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Program comprised of teachers and services providers. The purpose was to review data from Indicators 6, 7, and 12. The group drilled down data for Indicators 6 and 7 to determine reasons for the slippage in performance. Correlations were made between the LRE and the performance in the early childhood outcomes, most especially for Indicator 7, summary statements 2 in all three outcome areas. The group then developed plans for next steps to address the slippage for Indicators 6 and 7.

January 18 & 28, 2023: The full SPP/APR for FFY 2021 was presented to stakeholders on both these dates. January 18, 2023 was delivered virtually to members from the GAPSD, family and parents from parent groups (ACT, Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI), and members from the GEB. On January 28, 2023, the full SPP/APR was also presented both in-person and virtually to Division personnel, school teachers, members from GAPSD, along with family members and parents from ACT, the Down Syndrome Society, Guam PTI, a member from the GEB, and a high school student with disabilities. These presentations included the data and updates on the SSIP. Participants appreciated the information shared on the “5 Why’s” to show possible reasons for no progress on the SSIP target for FFY 2021.

For Indicator 8: Several focus groups and planning sessions were held on February 10, 2022, March 31, 2022, and July 23, 2022. Members included GDOE Division of personnel in charge of Parent Services, consultants from the University of Guam CEDDERS, and GAPSD parent members.

For Indicator 17 – SSIP: Nine planning meetings with GDOE personnel and UOG CEDDERS were held throughout the school year to ensure the SSIP schools were implementing PDSAs, conducting aimswebPlus assessments with fidelity, providing explicit instruction in reading, and overall, following the activities outlined in the SSIP. In addition to the planning meetings, seven core team meetings were held with the SSIP Principals, the teacher leaders, parents from the SSIP schools to review the Theory of Action, Logic Model, and Evaluation Plan. Two large stakeholder group meetings were also held with all personnel, inclusive of parents, from the SSIP schools on May 19, 2022 and October 13, 2022. Additionally, a session on Reading and the Continuous Improvement Cycle was held with all SSIP schools on August 9, 2022, along with a session for the scale up schools which was held on February 16, 2022.

 **Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

For this reporting period, there were seven in-person key planning meetings held monthly with personnel from GDOE and the University of Guam CEDDERS to ensure the SSIP schools were implementing the activities outlined in the SSIP through the review of data from aimswebPlus and the observations and fidelity checks of the reading programs implemented in the classrooms. Each meeting was was announced via email as participants were sent calendar invitations for the meetings.

Additionally, there were nine Core Planning Team meetings that are held every third Wednesday of the month. Attendees at these meetings comprised of the SSIP school principals, teacher leaders from each of the SSIP schools, GDOE Instructional Coaches, and parents of children with IEPs enrolled in the SSIP schools. During the Core Team meetings, agenda items included the following:
- results of the previous and current summative and secondary data (aimswebPlus) for the SSIP
- fidelity checks of aimswebPlus administration; fidelity of reading instruction; and SDI observations in the resource rooms
- results of the observations of the fidelity of reading instruction (Reading Mastery program) and the core Reading program
- continued training on PDSA, explicit instruction, and reading strategies
- progress and updates on the revisions of the Theory of Action, the Logic Model, and the Evaluation Plan

During one Core Team meeting, participants conducted a "5 Why's" activity to discuss reasons for little to no improvement with the SIMR. This activity revealed that teachers at the SSIP schools needed more training on the core reading program because the level of knowledge in reading content and skills varied among the schools. In the end, Core Team members, most especially the SSIP Principals, committed to ensuring the teachers in their schools attend all professional learning opportunities geared towards increasing the content knowledge and skills in teaching reading and conduct consistent fidelity checks and observations during reading instruction to ensure there is movement and progress in both the universal screener and the SIMR.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

Stakeholders recognized the need to review and revise the Theory of Action, the Logic Model and the Evaluation Plan to ensure alignment between goals, coherent improvement strategies and activities. Once the revisions were made, the stakeholders felt clarity was provided to validate all efforts put forth into the SSIP.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

Activities to be implemented in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR will be focused on continuing the scale-up process. GDOE has scaled-up in two distinct ways this year: through widespread implementation of reading evidence-based practices with the addition of 4 more schools for a total of 8 SSIP schools; and through deep changes in classroom practices with the addition of math evidence-based content strategies. Moreover, the scale-up process will be in conjunction with GDOE’s SPDG which establishes a professional development system centered on developing agency, choice, and engagement with stakeholders by utilizing the Leading by Convening framework. The SPDG is also focused on sustainability and the broad implementation of EBPs for reading. For this reporting year, the scale-up process focused on developing and providing support for implementation. This was accomplished through district and school-level professional learning. The scale-up schools are building their knowledge in Improvement Science and EBPs and starting the implementation of PDSAs. The target schools have started building capacity in EBPs for math. However, the math scale-up was paused to reexamine the district’s Math curriculum and address the gaps in the selected priority standards. Moving forward, the core tasks for the scale-up process that will be implemented next fiscal year and are related to the SiMR include:
1. Supporting scale-up schools in the implementation of Improvement Science (data literacy, data-based decision making, identification of EBPs).
2. Supporting Resource Room teachers from the scale-up schools in the implementation of EBP supplemental interventions in reading for students with IEPs.
3. Conducting a math curriculum audit.

Other activities unrelated to the scale-up process include supporting schools in the use of EBPs for family engagement through the use of the resource from the Institute of Education Sciences, Supporting Family Engagement in Foundational Reading Skills.

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

1. Supporting scale-up schools in the implementation of Improvement Science (data literacy, data-based decision making, identification of EBPs)
Timeline: February 2023 to February 2024
Expected outcomes:
- Teachers at scale-up schools will have increased knowledge and skill in data literacy and data-based decision making.
- Teachers at scale-up schools will develop a PDSA cycle.
- Students from the scale-up schools will be proficient reading as measured by the universal screener & the district-wide assessment
Data collection:
- Teacher survey
- Classroom observations & document reviews
- Universal screening & district-wide assessment data–to be reported in FFY2022

2. Supporting Resource Room teachers (RRTs) from the scale-up schools in the implementation of EBPs for supplemental interventions in reading for students with IEPs.
Timeline: February 2023 to February 2024
Expected Outcomes:
- RRTs have increased knowledge in EBPs for supplemental interventions in reading.
- RRTs are implementing EBP supplemental interventions with fidelity.
- Students with IEPs from the scale-up schools will be proficient in reading as measured by the universal screener & the district-wide assessment
 Data collection:
- Teacher survey
- Fidelity classroom observations
- Universal screening & district-wide assessment data–to be reported in FFY2022

3. Conducting a math curriculum audit.
Timeline: February 2023-May 2023
Expected Outcomes:
- Identification of learning gaps in the district’s math curriculum
Data collection:
- Completion of curriculum audit

4. Supporting schools in the use of EBPs for family engagement through the use of the resource from the Institute of Education Sciences, Supporting Family Engagement in Foundational Reading Skills.
Timeline: February 2023-May 2023
Expected Outcomes:
- Increased percentage of SSIP schools that implement family engagement strategies for improving reading
- Increased percentage of families who perceive they are knowledgeable about strategies for supporting reading at home in the community
Data collection:
- Family survey and/or interviews

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

Implementation of a Core Reading Program
A root causes analysis was conducted with grade-levels in the scale-up schools and SSIP principals to identify possible causes for the poor performance of students in reading. The “Five Whys” and the “Fish-bone diagram” improvement tools were used in the analysis. The root cause analysis revealed that schools were struggling with the lack of a guaranteed and viable reading program. The district recently adopted the “Journeys” reading program. However, the implementation of the program is patchwork with some schools using the program only as a supplemental resource. In addition, teachers noted a lack of training provided by the district in the implementation of the program.
Steps to address this barrier include working with the “Journeys” vendor to provide professional learning on how to effectively use the program for core instruction. In addition, overlaying the program with explicit instruction strategies so teachers can implement the program explicitly despite a lack of training in the program. Also, targeted monitoring by school administrators in the implementation of the program to ensure teachers are implementing essential practices well.

Recruitment and retention of certified teachers
This reporting period saw continued vacancies for certified teachers for both special education and general education. Though the amount of vacancies has decreased from the last reporting period, it is still an ongoing concern. One SSIP school is still waiting for a permanent special education teacher. In the general education category, currently there are 7 teacher vacancies at the SSIP target schools with 3 of the 7 vacancies in grades K-3. GDOE has addressed this barrier by leveraging district personnel such as SpEd coaches, service providers, and instructional coaches to cover vacant classes to address the teacher shortage. This strategy addresses the “symptoms” of the problem but does not tackle the underlying cause of the lack of certified teachers. Tackling this barrier involves community collaboration to determine what supports teachers need to stay in the teaching profession. This will involve working with GDOE’s teacher mentors and with community leaders

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).**

It should be noted that although aimswebPlus can be predictive of performance in the summative assessment, the data from the screener demonstrates that proficiency in aimswebPlus has not correlated with success in the summative assessment. As an example, in Spring ‘22, 28% of 3rd graders at the SSIP target schools scored at the 45th percentile & above in ORF in aimswebPlus. However, on the summative assessment (ACT Aspire), only 9%-21% of all 3rd graders at the 4 target schools were proficient in reading. For all 3rd grade students in GDOE, the district proficiency rate was 13%. Two SSIP schools surpassed the district’s overall average with 21% at SSIP School 1 & 14% at SSIP School 4. Also, the data for all SSIP schools were higher than in FFY2018 (pre-pandemic) in which only 5%-9% of all 3rd graders in the SSIP schools were proficient in reading. In stark contrast, for this reporting period, x% of students with IEPs were proficient in reading which was the same in FFY2018. Hence, as general education students continue to make progress despite the impact of the pandemic, students with IEPs continue to demonstrate low performance in reading-–pre and post pandemic. The data collected show that the gap widens as students move up grade-levels. In reviewing other data sources such as the IEP, it is evident that the SDI for students with IEPs needs to be clearly outlined to ensure the unique needs of students are addressed. To change the trajectory of students with IEPs, GDOE recognizes that there needs to be a shift from a procedural focus to a more substantive basis that builds the capacity of Special Education teachers in identifying and delivering effective Specially Designed Instruction. Instruction is essentially “where the rubber meets the road”. As Anita Archer, expert in explicit instruction, acknowledged, “the magic is in the instruction”. Moving forward, the next steps that GDOE has set forth in this report provides a targeted focus on the instruction that students with IEPs are receiving to ensure it is effective and incorporates the use of EBPs and interventions. Moreover, GDOE will work to ensure that teachers are systematically monitoring the progress of students with IEPs through the PDSA cycle and are adapting instruction, based on the data, to meet the emerging needs of students.

## 17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 17 - OSEP Response

Guam provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2021 data for this indicator and steps Guam has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## 17 - Required Actions

# Certification

**Instructions**

**Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.**

**Certify**

**I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.**

**Select the certifier’s role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

**Name:**

Tom Babauta

**Title:**

Assistant Superintendent of Special Education

**Email:**

tcbabauta@gdoe.net

**Phone:**

(671)777-7732

**Submitted on:**

04/25/23 4:30:22 PM

# Determination Enclosures

## RDA Matrix

**Guam**

2023 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

**Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination[[10]](#footnote-11)**

| **Percentage (%)** | **Determination** |
| --- | --- |
| 65.00% | Needs Assistance |

**Results and Compliance Overall Scoring**

|  | **Total Points Available** | **Points Earned** | **Score (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Results** | 8 | 4 | 50.00% |
| **Compliance** | 12 | 9 | 75.00% |

**2023 Part B Results Matrix**

**Reading Assessment Elements**

| **Reading Assessment Elements** | **Performance (%)** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Average Percentage of 3rd through 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments** | \* | 0 |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |

\*Due to privacy concerns the Department has chosen to suppress this calculation.

**Math Assessment Elements**

| **Math Assessment Elements** | **Performance (%)** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Average Percentage of 3rd through 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments** | \* | 0 |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |

\*Due to privacy concerns the Department has chosen to suppress this calculation.

**Exiting Data Elements**

| **Exiting Data Elements** | **Performance (%)** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out Over Previous 3 Years** | 10 | 2 |
| **Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma Over Previous 3 Years\*\*** | 89 | 2 |

\*\*When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

**2023 Part B Compliance Matrix**

| **Part B Compliance Indicator[[11]](#footnote-12)** | **Performance (%)**  | **Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.** | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.** | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.** | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation** | 83.77% | N/A | 1 |
| **Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday** | 100.00% | N/A | 2 |
| **Indicator 13: Secondary transition** | 94.80% | N/A | 2 |
| **Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data** | 100.00% |  | 2 |
| **Timely State Complaint Decisions** | 100.00% |  | 2 |
| **Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions** | N/A |  | N/A |
| **Longstanding Noncompliance** |  |  | 0 |
| **Specific Conditions** | None |  |  |
| **Uncorrected identified noncompliance** | Yes, 5 or more years |  |  |

## Data Rubric

**Guam**

FFY 2021 APR[[12]](#footnote-13)

|   | **Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data** |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **APR Indicator** | **Valid and Reliable** | **Total** |
| **1** | 1 | 1 |
| **2** | 1 | 1 |
| **3A** | 1 | 1 |
| **3B** | 1 | 1 |
| **3C** | 1 | 1 |
| **3D** | 1 | 1 |
| **4A** | 1 | 1 |
| **4B** | N/A | 0 |
| **5** | 1 | 1 |
| **6** | 1 | 1 |
| **7** | 1 | 1 |
| **8** | 1 | 1 |
| **9** | N/A | 0 |
| **10** | N/A | 0 |
| **11** | 1 | 1 |
| **12** | 1 | 1 |
| **13** | 1 | 1 |
| **14** | 1 | 1 |
| **15** | 1 | 1 |
| **16** | 1 | 1 |
| **17** | 1 | 1 |
|  | **Subtotal** | 18 |
| **APR Score Calculation** | **Timely Submission Points** - If the FFY 2021 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right. | 5 |
|  | **Grand Total** - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) = | 23 |

|  |  | **618 Data[[13]](#footnote-14)** |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table** | **Timely** | **Complete Data** | **Passed Edit Check** | **Total** |
| **Child Count/****Ed Envs** **Due Date: 4/6/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Personnel Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Exiting Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Discipline Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **State Assessment Due Date: 12/21/2022** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/4/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
|  |  |  | **Subtotal** | 21 |
| **618 Score Calculation** |  |  | **Grand Total** (Subtotal X 1.23809524) = | 26.00 |

| **Indicator Calculation** |  |
| --- | --- |
| A. APR Grand Total | 23 |
| B. 618 Grand Total | 26.00 |
| C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) = | 49.00 |
| Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator | 3 |
| Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator | 0.00 |
| **Denominator** | 49.00 |
| D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator\*) = | 1.0000 |
| E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) = | 100.00 |

**\*Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data**

**DATE: February 2023 Submission**

**SPP/APR Data**

**1) Valid and Reliable Data** - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

**Part B 618 Data**

**1) Timely** – A State will receive one point if it submits all EDFacts files or the entire EMAPS survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **618 Data Collection** | **EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey** | **Due Date** |
| Part B Child Count and Educational Environments | C002 & C089 | 1st Wednesday in April |
| Part B Personnel  | C070, C099, C112 | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B Exiting | C009 | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B Discipline  | C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144 | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B Assessment | C175, C178, C185, C188 | Wednesday in the 3rd week of December (aligned with CSPR data due date) |
| Part B Dispute Resolution  | Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services | Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS | 1st Wednesday in May |

**2) Complete Data** – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to EDFacts aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in EMAPS. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

**3) Passed Edit Check –** A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

## Dispute Resolution



## How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP’s IDEA Website.  How the Department Made Determinations in 2023 will be posted in June 2023. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

[https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/](https://nam10.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fsites.ed.gov%2Fidea%2Fhow-the-department-made-determinations%2F&data=05%7C01%7Cdan.royal%40aemcorp.com%7C56561a053eed4e4dffea08db4cd0ea7f%7C7a41925ef6974f7cbec30470887ac752%7C0%7C0%7C638188232405320922%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=REJfNg%2BRs0Gk73rS2KzO2SIVRCUhHLglGd6vbm9wEwc%3D&reserved=0)

1. Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2023: Part B." [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2023_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a ‘0’. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)